

# CHAPTER 2—DESCRIPTIONS OF THE ALTERNATIVES

## 2.1 INTRODUCTION

Chapter 2 describes four alternative Resource Management Plans (RMP) for the management of the Resource Management Plan Planning Area (RMPPA). These alternatives are divided into one no action alternative and three action alternatives as follows: Alternative 1 (No Action—Continuation of Existing Management Direction), Alternative 2 (Emphasis on the Development of Resources), Alternative 3 (Emphasis on Protection of Resources), and Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative). Alternative 1 includes direction provided by the Great Divide RMP (BLM 1990a) and a new direction and policy that have been subsequently developed and resulting amendments to the plan. The three action alternatives were developed to present a range of management options to guide decision-making for managing uses and activities within the RMPPA. Each alternative management plan is intended to minimize adverse impacts on cultural and natural resources while providing for compatible resource use and development opportunities, consistent with current laws, regulations, and policies.

Alternatives were developed to establish a framework for measuring the impacts on the RMPPA that might occur as a result of future management. The alternatives themselves do not constitute management decisions, but instead represent reasonable approaches to managing land and activities consistent with laws, regulations, and policies. The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has the discretion to select an alternative in its entirety or to combine aspects of the various alternatives presented in this draft to develop the Proposed RMP and Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires the development and analysis of several alternatives, including a No Action Alternative, to measure the impacts that a set of actions could have on the RMPPA. According to NEPA, BLM must consider these impacts in developing the RMP for the RMPPA, as described in Chapter 1.

Section 2.2 presents an overview of the alternatives development process, including alternatives and management options considered but eliminated from detailed analysis. Section 2.3 describes management guidance and actions that are applicable or common to all alternatives, including the Alternative 1. Management alternatives considered in the Draft EIS are described in detail in Sections 2.4 through 2.7. Section 2.8 presents a comparison summary of impacts from management actions proposed for the four management alternatives addressed in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIS. Section 2.9 describes the monitoring strategy to be applied to the management of all land and resource management programs. The formation of Activity Plan Working Groups (APWG) is also described in Section 2.9.

## 2.2 DEVELOPMENT OF ALTERNATIVES

The following sections describe the alternatives development process, including management goals.

### 2.2.1 Alternatives Development Process

BLM complied with NEPA requirements in the developing of alternatives for this RMP Draft EIS (DEIS), including seeking public input and analyzing an adequate range of reasonable alternatives, including Alternative 1. Alternative formulation took into consideration existing decisions in the Great Divide RMP, the 2001 Great Divide RMP evaluation (the results of which were presented in Chapter 1), and issues and concerns developed internally and solicited from the public during scoping.

The existing Great Divide RMP (1990 Great Divide Resource Area Record of Decision [ROD] and Approved RMP [BLM 1990a]) served as the point of departure for Alternative 1. Many of the management actions occurring in the 1990 RMP were found to be acceptable and reasonable; thus, there was limited need to develop alternative management prescriptions under the three action alternatives. In many cases, management prescriptions are the same across all alternatives or in some cases reflect only a decision to implement or not implement an action. Actions that are the same across all four alternatives are presented in Section 2.3.

Public input received during the scoping process was considered to ensure that all issues and concerns would be addressed, as appropriate, in developing the alternatives and their management action options. The scoping process and its results, as well as opportunities for future public and agency involvement, are summarized in Section 5.2.

Where necessary to meet the planning criteria for the RMPPA, to address comments from cooperating agencies, and to provide a reasonable range of alternatives, the alternatives include management options for the RMPPA that would modify or amend decisions in the Great Divide RMP. Finally, all alternatives meet the management goals for each BLM resource and land management program.

Development of alternatives began with the identification of management actions and the analysis of the environmental effects of Alternative 1. Other alternatives were then developed to address resource issues and concerns identified through the analysis of Alternative 1.

Review of the alternatives included cooperating agency involvement to ensure consistency with other agency goals and objectives prior to the development of the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 4). In addition, the Preferred Alternative was developed following a review of the management actions and environmental effects of the other three alternatives.

An adequate range of alternatives was developed for a comparative analysis. Management alternatives considered in the DEIS are described in detail in Sections 2.4 through 2.7 and are presented in Table 2-1.

## **2.2.2 Management Goals**

Management goals were defined for each resource management category and land use program that BLM must address in the planning process. The management goals for each resource management category and land use program are presented in Table 2-1.

## **2.2.3 Alternatives and Management Options Considered But Eliminated From Detailed Analysis**

The following alternatives and management options were considered as possible ways of resolving resource management issues and conflicts but were eliminated from detailed analysis because they were unreasonable or not practical as a result of technical, legal, or policy factors.

### **Wild Horses and Burros**

In developing the wild horse management alternatives that were considered in detail, the following two alternatives were considered but eliminated from detailed analysis:

### **Establish Herd Management Areas in Herd Areas Not Supporting Wild Horses**

The three herd areas (HA) within the Rawlins RMPPA (Checkerboard South, Doty Mountain/Cherokee, and Bolton Ranch) that do not contain established herd management areas (HMA) were reviewed to determine if the conditions precluding HMA designation were still valid. Previous planning efforts determined these HAs failed to meet criteria for suitably maintaining a healthy population of wild horses in accordance with the intent of the Act. Those criteria failures included the following:

- The area was composed of more than 50 percent privately controlled land and the private landowners did not express an interest in having their lands included in an HMA.
- The area contained numerous barriers that prevented wild horse access to adequate yearlong habitat.
- Most of the horses in these areas were privately owned and had been removed.

It was determined the conditions within these HAs have not changed significantly from when the HAs were originally evaluated. In addition, establishing HMAs within these HAs would require allocation of sufficient forage to sustain a population of wild horses on public lands, thereby removing some or all of the permitted livestock from the HAs. Therefore, an alternative to establish wild horse HMAs in any of these three HAs will not be considered further.

### **Elimination of All Wild Horses from the Rawlins RMPPA**

This alternative would be viable only if the management of wild horses were not possible in any HAs located in the planning area. As this is not the case, this alternative would contravene the intent and letter of the Wild Horse & Burro Act of 1971, which states "... they (wild horses) are considered in the area where presently found as an integral part of the natural system of the public lands" and should be "protected and managed as components of the public lands." This alternative was not considered further.

### **Reintroduction of a Wild Bison Population**

Public comment received during scoping suggested that a wild, free-roaming population of bison should be returned to the Red Desert Basin within the RMPPA. The alternative was not considered in detail because of the following issues identified during alternative formulation: (1) Wyoming law does not currently provide for the presence of free-ranging bison outside the Yellowstone ecosystem; (2) big game (antelope, deer, and elk) would be adversely affected by the construction and maintenance of fences that would be required to confine a bison population to any area equaling or approximating the Great Divide Basin; and (3) BLM lacks the statutory authority to manage any species of animal on the public lands except wild horses, which already exist in significant numbers in the Great Divide Basin and areas adjacent to it.

### **Elimination of Livestock Grazing**

The elimination of livestock grazing from all public lands in the planning area was considered as one management option to resolving range and watershed management issues in the current Great Divide RMP. However, after reviewing vegetation data, the rangeland health assessment, and public scoping comments, BLM concluded that eliminating livestock grazing from all public lands continues not to be a viable or necessary management option.

## Western Heritage Alternative

The Western Heritage Alternative was developed or endorsed by a number of state and national conservation organizations and was provided to BLM during public scoping. The Western Heritage Alternative, as presented, incorporated many timely issues and concerns that would be required of any balanced approach to managing the public lands. Much of the information provided was a description of past and present condition of resources similar to the existing environment discussion provided in Chapter 3. To its credit, the Western Heritage Alternative did provide or develop issues and concerns into management recommendations for many of the resource issues that it presented. However, the Western Heritage Alternative proposed that a “no surface occupancy” (NSO) stipulation be considered for surface-disturbing and disruptive activities on more than 90 percent of the RMPPA (about 3,117,000 acres). This level of NSO was considered not reasonable and, therefore, was not considered in detail in the Rawlins RMP/DEIS. Many of the resource issues and concerns addressed in the Western Heritage Alternative were considered during development of alternatives considered in detail in the RMP.

## Oil and Gas Development Allowable to Limits of Existing RMP Only

An alternative was considered that would have limited oil and gas exploration and development activity to levels analyzed in the existing Great Divide RMP. However, following further analysis and discussion, this alternative was considered to be unrealistic and unreasonable because reasonably foreseeable exploration levels established in 1986 in the Great Divide RMP have almost been achieved. The Rawlins Field Office (RFO) evaluation of the Great Divide RMP in 2001 identified the fluid mineral reasonable foreseeable development (RFD) at an analysis level that would be exceeded in the near future. This alternative would have effectively limited oil and gas exploration and development to that which has already been approved. In addition, public comments received during scoping and issue identification indicated a general acceptance of continued mineral development, provided it is properly managed.

## Expanded Wilderness Study Area Alternative

Several citizens' proposals for wilderness study areas (WSA) were received and reviewed by the RFO. These included proposals in the Adobe Town, Kinney Rim, Wild Cow, and Ferris Mountains areas, including approximately 316,000 acres of public land. In response to these proposals, the RFO reviewed the current policy and guidance on wilderness inventory, identification, management, and protection of lands with wilderness characteristics. A WSA expansion alternative will not be analyzed in detail for the following reasons.

- The authority set forth in Section 603(a) of the Federal Land Policy Management Act (FLPMA) to complete the three-part wilderness review process (inventory, study, and report to Congress) expired on October 21, 1993; Section 202 of FLPMA does not apply to new WSA proposals; and consideration of new WSA proposals on BLM-administered public lands is no longer valid.
- In April 2003 settlement of a lawsuit over the designation of new WSAs on BLM-administered public lands in Utah (State of Utah vs. Department of Interior 2003) resulted in a change of direction on wilderness designation. The settlement resulted in the issuance of BLM Washington Office Instruction Memorandum No. 2003-195 (Rescission of National Level Policy Guidance on Wilderness Review and Land Use Planning) which rescinded the *BLM Wilderness Inventory and Study Procedure Handbook (H-6310-1)*.
- FLPMA land use plan decisions may accord special management protection for special values through the land use planning process. It should be noted that in response to public requests that BLM grant WSA status to various public lands, BLM completed an evaluation of the various

proposals to establish the presence or absence of wilderness characteristics (i.e., naturalness, solitude, primitive recreation). Two areas, the Adobe Town fringe and West Ferris Mountain, were determined to support wilderness characteristics. Alternatives discussed in Chapter 2 were developed to consider protection and management for the special values.

- BLM may continue to inventory public lands for resources or other values, including wilderness characteristics, as a part of managing the public lands and land use planning. Information provided by the public has been considered along with all other resource information in the Rawlins land use planning process.

## Consideration of Additional Areas as Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

Public comment received during scoping suggested that a number of areas be considered for designation as Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC). Designation of Shirley Mountains, Chain Lakes, Ferris Dunes, and white-tailed prairie dog complexes as ACECs has been considered in the alternatives analyzed. However, the designations of plover concentration areas, the Bates Hole/Chalk Mountain cushion plant community, and Powder Rim juniper woodland have not been considered in any of the alternatives analyzed. BLM is required to determine if areas proposed for ACEC designation meet the relevance and importance criteria (as defined in BLM Manual Section 1613) prior to inclusion in the RMP process. Areas that did not meet the relevance and importance criteria were dropped from further consideration for ACEC designation (BLM 2004). Areas that met the relevance and importance criteria are discussed in Chapter 3 and management of these areas is presented in Section 2.3.11 and Table 2-1 below.

## 2.3 MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES

This section describes management actions that are applicable or common to all alternatives. Alternative-specific management actions follow in Table 2-1.

Management actions common to all alternatives can result because of specific limitations on management of resources and land use programs that guided the development of the management alternatives. These limitations are defined in various laws and regulations that govern BLM management decisions. They are also set forth in the planning criteria to ensure that management actions within all alternatives are compliant with nondiscretionary laws and regulations. In many cases, these limitations preclude the development of alternatives to a given action. In some cases, these laws and regulations limit management to either implementing or not implementing the action.

In other cases, management actions are consistent across all alternatives because actions have been carried forward from the existing Great Divide RMP. Where management actions from the existing Great Divide RMP were found to be meeting BLM's current goals, alternatives to acceptable management actions or direction were found to be unnecessary. In many cases, the decisions from the existing RMP are still appropriate to meet the goals and objectives for management of the public lands.

### 2.3.1 Air Quality

Air quality standards are maintained by the State of Wyoming, which determines whether it is necessary to regulate emissions. When necessary, the state would regulate emissions through its State Implementation Plan (SIP) for air quality by promulgating the appropriate rule. Objectives of the State of Wyoming SIP would include the protection of public health and safety and the well-being of sensitive natural resources. Thus, BLM would minimize, within the scope of its authority, any emissions that may add to atmospheric deposition, cause violations of air quality standards, or degrade visibility. The

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) would provide oversight responsibility during this process and would approve the State of Wyoming SIP.

State standards enforced in the RMPPA would be as strict or stricter than federal standards. Special requirements to alleviate air quality impacts would be considered on a case-by-case basis in processing land use authorizations.

BLM would cooperate with the operation of the National Atmospheric Deposition Program (NADP)/National Trends Network atmospheric deposition monitoring site, as well as in the collection of basic climate and meteorological data from remote automatic weather stations. The NADP sites included in this analysis are Snowy Range, Brooklyn Lake, and South Pass City.

BLM would follow the specific guidance for the application of air quality protection measures (presented in Appendix 4) within the RMPPA.

### **2.3.2 Cultural Resources**

Cultural resources would be identified and protected on a case-by-case basis, according to site-specific needs.

Cultural properties eligible for National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) listing would be managed for preservation of cultural and historic values (Appendix 5).

Where the setting contributes to NRHP eligibility, management actions resulting in visual elements that diminish the integrity of the property's significant historic features would be intensively managed. Unevaluated portions of the setting would be managed as contributing until a cultural inventory and evaluation is completed and the setting is determined to be contributing or non-contributing (Appendix 5).

### **2.3.3 Wildland Fire and Fuels Management**

BLM would manage wildland fire mitigation and fuels activities to first provide for firefighter and public safety. Public lands within the checkerboard or other intermixed landownership areas would be managed in association with the private and state lands therein. Appropriate management response (AMR) would most often result in suppression activities (Map 2-1).

AMRs for special management areas (SMA) would protect or enhance the relevant and important values of the ACEC or other SMAs requiring special management attention. A high priority for fire management activities would be given to areas identified as communities at risk (as identified in Federal Register, Volume 66, Number 3, 2001), industrial interface areas, and areas containing resource values considered high priority within the RMPPA (Map 2-1).

Fuel treatments, including prescribed fire and mechanical, chemical, and biological treatments, would be used for fuels reduction and to meet other multiple-use resource objectives, including returning fire to its natural role in the ecosystem (also see the vegetation section of Table 2-1). Identified wildland-urban interfaces (WUI) and communities at risk would receive priority for fuels reduction.

Rehabilitation and restoration efforts would be undertaken to protect and sustain ecosystems, public health, and safety, and to help communities protect infrastructure.

### 2.3.4 Forestry

All forest and woodlands in the planning area would be open to noncommercial harvest of minor wood products, such as fuelwood, posts and poles, Christmas trees, and wildlings. Forest and woodlands management would also include manipulation of aspen, juniper, and other noncommercial tree species to meet forest health and/or other multiple-use objectives.

### 2.3.5 Lands and Realty

The RMPPA would be open to operation of the public land laws, the Mining Law of 1872, and to locatable mineral entry except for 1,582,260 acres of existing withdrawals (see Section 3.6).

In compliance with Section 204(1) of FLPMA, reviews of withdrawn lands in the planning area would be completed to determine whether existing withdrawals are serving or needed for their intended purposes. The existing withdrawals in the planning area would remain in place unless or until it is determined they should be terminated and, if necessary, a plan amendment to the Rawlins RMP is made. Such determination or amendment would be based on full examination of the issues associated with withdrawal terminations, including the land use, environmental, and other factors associated with opening public lands now closed to entry under the public land laws or to mineral location under the mining laws. Where appropriate and necessary to protect other resource values, new withdrawals would be pursued and implemented prior to terminating any existing withdrawals. Existing and new withdrawals are listed in Table 2-2 at the end of this chapter.

Coal classifications are no longer necessary on 671,768 acres in the RMPPA. Existing withdrawals would be reviewed and could be terminated, when appropriate.

Nonfederal lands would be considered for acquisition to meet the objectives of the various resource management programs. Examples of lands that would be acquired include inholdings within WSAs, some SMAs, and HMAs (Appendix 6).

Proposals for alternative energy development would be considered on a case-by-case basis. No proposals for alternative energy development, other than wind power, are anticipated to occur in the foreseeable future; therefore, only wind energy potential is considered. Proposals for location of wind energy development would be considered on a case-by-case basis and subject to a site-specific NEPA analysis. Areas with important or sensitive resource values would be avoided. Avoidance areas would vary by alternative.

All BLM-administered public lands, except WSAs and some SMAs (including ACECs), would be open to consideration for placement of transportation and utility rights-of-way (ROW) systems. Each transportation system and utility ROW would be located adjacent to existing facilities, when possible. Areas with important or sensitive resource values would be avoided. Existing major transportation and utility ROW routes, identified in Chapter 3, and presented in Map 2-2, would be designated corridors. However, major transportation routes within the RMPPA that are located east of the Carbon County-Albany County line would not be considered for ROW corridor designation because of the scattered public land ownership pattern in the area. All corridors would be designated for power lines (above ground and buried), telephone lines, fiber optic lines, pipelines, access roads and other linear type ROWs. Specific proposals would require site-specific environmental analysis and compliance with established permitting processes. Activities generally excluded from ROW corridors include mineral materials disposal, range and wildlife habitat improvements involving surface disturbance and facility construction, campgrounds, and public recreation facilities and other facilities that would attract public use. ROW facilities would not be placed adjacent to each other if issues with safety or incompatibility or resource

conflicts were identified. The designated width, allowable uses, and excluded uses for each corridor may be modified during implementation of the approved RMP. All designated ROW corridors would avoid to the extent possible those areas identified on Map 17 and Table 2-3 (presented at the end of this chapter). The number, type, extent, and proximity of new ROWs within designated corridors would be determined when the criteria (Appendix 6) for each corridor are identified.

Mitigation requirements for surface-disturbing and disruptive activities would be applied to activities related to utility/transportation systems to protect important resource values (Appendix 1).

Certain lands withdrawn for Seminoe Reservoir (2,000 acres) and the Savery-Pothook area (1,205 acres), currently managed by the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR), are being considered for revocation (Appendix 7). The revocation was reviewed by BLM and a determination made that the lands are suitable for return to public domain status because they are no longer needed for the purpose for which they were withdrawn. Lands considered for revocation have been reviewed for management options and a determination made that these lands would be managed the same as adjacent public lands.

### **2.3.6 Livestock Grazing**

Livestock grazing would be managed to provide for protection or enhancement of all resource values. The Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands (S&Gs) (BLM 1997) would be implemented when authorizing livestock grazing use and related activities in the planning area (Appendix 8).

The current amounts, kinds, and seasons of livestock grazing use would be authorized until monitoring indicates a grazing use adjustment is necessary, or that a class of livestock or season of use modification can be accommodated. Monitoring would include coordination, consultation, and negotiation with grazing permittees.

Requests for changes in season-of-use or kind-of-livestock would be considered on a case-by-case basis and reviewed to determine range suitability and to evaluate potential impacts to both riparian and upland vegetation and other land resource uses.

Designated camping areas, wetland/riparian spring exclosures, sensitive plant species exclosures, some wildlife management areas, coal mines, and some oil and gas production facilities are closed to grazing.

Domestic sheep and goats would not be authorized within 9 miles of identified wild bighorn sheep habitat unless a natural or topographic feature provides an effective barrier (Map 2-3).

### **2.3.7 Minerals**

The Energy Policy and Conservation Act Amendments (EPCA) of 2000, Public Law (PL) 106-469, directed the Secretary of the Interior to conduct an inventory of oil and natural gas resources beneath federal lands. The act also directed the Department of Interior to identify the extent and nature of any restrictions to resource development. As a result, the Departments of the Interior, Agriculture, and Energy released a report, *Scientific Inventory of Onshore Federal Lands' Oil and Gas Resources and Reserves and the Extent and Nature of Restrictions or Impediments to their Development* (referred to as the "EPCA Inventory"), in January 2003.

BLM is integrating the results of the EPCA Inventory into its RMPs. The oil and gas resource inventory data is integrated into the RFD scenario that predicts future mineral development within the RMPPA. The restrictions and impediments to mineral resource development would be considered throughout the RMP with the intent to—

- Clearly present mitigation requirements necessary to reduce impacts of oil and gas operations on other resources.
- Ensure that such mitigation is either statutorily required or scientifically justifiable and is the least restrictive measure necessary to accomplish the desired level of resource protection. The mitigation requirements would be monitored to determine if more or less restrictive measures might accomplish the same goal.

Oil and gas lease stipulations may be modified or eliminated using the exception, modification, or waiver criteria outlined in this RMP (Appendix 9) or through more site-specific environmental analysis. Those stipulations that are either too restrictive or too lenient to accomplish the desired resource protection would be changed if monitoring or new scientific data justify the change. Clarifying changes may be made to the wording of oil and gas lease stipulations as long as there is no substantial change to the mitigated protection, as justified by new scientific data or monitoring.

There is no reasonably foreseeable coal development in the Rawlins RMPPA for the 20-year analysis period for this EIS. Only the first two steps of the coal screening process (Appendix 2) have been conducted on the federal coal lands that have federal coal occurrence, which resulted in a determination that approximately 5,029 acres (containing an estimated 70.1 million tons of surface mineable federal coal) were unsuitable for surface coal mining. Approximately 56,240 acres (containing an estimated 2,388.8 million tons of surface mineable federal coal) were identified as acceptable for further leasing consideration. The unsuitable coal areas are depicted on Appendix Maps A2-2, A2-3, and A2-4. The remaining steps of the coal leasing process would be completed upon receipt of a lease-by-application. Per regulations found at 43 CFR 3461, the coal screening process cannot be applied to lands currently leased for coal. Within the RMPPA, seven existing coal leases are exempt from the coal screening process: Hanna Basin (six leases; 19,016 acres of federal coal land) and Carbon Basin (one lease; 5,235 acres of federal coal land).

The only coal activity analyzed in the EIS is reclamation activity in the Hanna Basin. Future economic conditions may change and make the existing Hanna Basin coal leases more likely to be developed. In Carbon Basin, in addition to the existing lease acreage, an additional 6,693 acres and 163,300,000 tons of federal coal are acceptable for further consideration for leasing as a result of the 1998 Carbon Basin RMP Amendment. The existing coal lease for Carbon Basin is addressed in the cumulative impact section.

No decisions on lands acceptable for further consideration for leasing would be made until after a lease application is received.

Leases would be considered on a case-by-case basis only, as lease applications are received. The first two steps of the coal screening process would be revisited, and coal screening would be completed [including the multiple-use screen and the surface-owner consultation screen].

Federal coal lease applications would be accepted only on those federal coal lands with development potential identified as acceptable for further leasing consideration after application of the coal unsuitability criteria (the above-mentioned approximately 56,240 acres and 2,388.8 million tons of surface mineable federal coal) (Maps A2-2, A2-3, and A2-4 and Appendix 2).

About 6,693 acres of federal coal lands containing 163 million tons of federal coal in the Carbon Basin are acceptable for further leasing consideration. Of the 6,693 acres of federal coal lands, 120 acres are acceptable for leasing consideration by subsurface mining methods only. This decision has been carried forward from the 1998 Carbon Basin RMP Amendment (1998 Carbon Basin RMP Amendment for acreages, tonnages, and locations of areas within the Carbon Basin acceptable for leasing consideration).

All lands open to oil and gas leasing consideration also would be open to geophysical exploration, subject to appropriate resource surveys, surface protection measures, adequate bonding, and adherence to State of Wyoming standards for geophysical operations.

Vehicular use for necessary tasks (as defined in the Glossary), such as geophysical exploration including project survey and layout, is subject to off-highway vehicle (OHV) designations. Exceptions may be necessary to protect other resources on a case-by-case basis following environmental analysis.

With the exception of WSAs and some other SMAs, the remainder of the planning area would be open to consideration for leasing of oil shale, geothermal resources, and nonenergy leasable minerals.

Approximately 1,582,260 acres would be closed to locatable mineral entry under existing mineral location withdrawals (Map 2-4). The remainder of the planning area would be open to mineral location. Stipulations to protect sensitive resource values would be based on interdisciplinary review of individual proposals and environmental analysis.

Mineral material disposals are discretionary actions. Disposal would be considered on a case-by-case basis. Stipulations to protect important surface values would be based on interdisciplinary review of individual proposals.

### **2.3.8 Off-Highway Vehicle Management**

With some exceptions, the planning area would be open to use of motorized over-the-snow vehicles, provided that they do not adversely affect wildlife or vegetation (see the SMA section and the wildlife and fisheries section of Table 2-1 for specific OHV exceptions).

In conformance with BLM Washington Office IM No. 2004-005 (October 1, 2003), the RMPPA will be divided into areas that are open, limited, or closed to OHV travel (Map 2-5). Those areas that are designated limited may have seasonal restrictions or travel limitations to either existing or designated roads and vehicle routes, or any combination of these. Until the designation process is completed, travel in Limited to Designated Areas (LDA) would remain limited to existing roads and vehicle routes. Travel on parcels of public land not having legal public access would remain limited to existing roads and vehicle routes.

Off-road OHV use would be allowed for necessary tasks except in WSAs and specific SMAs (see SMAs portion of Table 2-1).

The Encampment River Canyon Area (about 6,700 acres) would be closed to motorized vehicle use, including over-the-snow vehicles, December 1 to April 30, to reduce stress on wildlife that may winter in the canyon area. The Encampment River Trail would be closed to all types of motorized vehicle use year-round.

### **2.3.9 Paleontology**

Paleontological resources would be managed to protect their important scientific values. Area closures, restrictions, or other mitigation requirements for the protection of paleontological values would be determined on a case-by-case basis. Collecting of scientifically significant vertebrate fossils by qualified paleontologists would be allowed by permit only.

## 2.3.10 Recreation Resources

Existing recreation sites would be maintained or improved to assure continued availability to the recreating public. Additional recreation sites would be considered for development based on need or demand, site suitability, and legal public access.

The entire RMPPA would be open to dispersed recreation with the exception of specific areas that must be excluded to protect public health and safety or special resource values.

## 2.3.11 Special Management Areas

### Wilderness Study Areas

WSAs (Map 2-6) would be managed according to the Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review, until Congress either designates each WSA as “wilderness” or releases it from consideration and it reverts to multiple-use land.

The Ferris Mountains WSA (21,880 acres) would be closed to all types of motorized vehicle use.

### Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

Under different alternatives, designations of the following areas vary from ACEC to areas with other special management prescriptions. For the designation of these areas as ACECs or other special management areas, refer to Table 2-1 (Maps 2-7 through 2-13). Occurrence and acreages vary per alternative for each of these areas.

#### Como Bluff Area

Case-by-case examination of any proposed surface-disturbing and disruptive activities would be made to determine potential adverse effects and appropriate mitigation would be applied to minimize those effects.

#### Sand Hills Area and Potential JO Ranch Expansion

No surface occupancy would be allowed on the 18 acres around the JO Ranch buildings. Developments, uses, and facilities would be managed spatially to avoid damage to vegetation.

#### Jep Canyon Area

Surface-disturbing activities would be intensively managed to prevent loss of significant habitat. Management would be applied on a case-by-case basis to determine potential adverse effects and appropriate mitigation to minimize those effects. Developments, uses, and facilities would be managed to avoid damage to vegetation and wildlife habitat.

#### Shamrock Hills Area

Surface-disturbing activities would be intensively managed to maintain raptor-nesting habitat. Management would be applied on a case-by-case basis. Developments, uses, and facilities would be managed to avoid damage to vegetation and wildlife habitat.

The area would be open to oil and gas leasing with intensive management of surface-disturbing and disruptive activities.

### **Stratton Sagebrush Steppe Research Area**

The entire area (5,530 acres) would be closed to locatable mineral entry, mineral material disposal, and land tenure adjustments, including sales. Withdrawals would be pursued.

Motorized vehicle use would be limited to designated roads and vehicle routes.

### **Laramie Peak Area**

The area would be open to oil and gas leasing with intensive management of surface-disturbing and disruptive activities. Plans of operations would be required for locatable mineral exploration and development (except casual use), for disturbance of five acres or more.

### **Red Rim-Daley Area**

The area would be open to oil and gas leasing with intensive management of surface-disturbing and disruptive activities.

### **Pennock Mountain Area**

The Pennock Mountain crucial elk winter range (9,806 acres) would be closed to human presence from November 15 to April 30.

### **Wick-Beumee Area**

The public land within the Wick-Beumee wildlife habitat management area (280 acres) (Map 2-10) would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area. The Wick-Beumee crucial elk winter range (280 acres) would be closed to motorized vehicle use, including over-the-snow vehicles, from November 15 to April 30.

### **Historic Trails (Cherokee, Overland, Rawlins to Baggs, and Rawlins to Fort Washakie)**

Sections of the historic trails with intact trail traces (two-tracks, etc.) would be preserved in their present condition. Historic trail use that would result in adverse effects to the trail trace (Appendix 5) would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

Actions resulting in linear crossings of the trails would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, and surface-disturbing and disruptive activities would be intensively managed.

Where the setting of the trails contributes to NRHP eligibility, actions resulting in visual elements that diminish the integrity of the property's significant historic features would be intensively managed. Unevaluated portions of the trail setting would be managed as contributing until a cultural inventory is completed and the setting is determined to be contributing or noncontributing (Appendix 5).

### **Upper Muddy Creek Watershed/Grizzly Area**

To protect the Colorado River cutthroat trout reintroduction area, 4,520 acres of public lands and 69,770,000 tons of federal coal would be unsuitable for further leasing consideration (Map A2-4 in Appendix 2). For additional coal management discussion, see Section 2.3.7 and the minerals section of Table 2-1.

Rehabilitation of degraded stream reaches would be carried out in specific problem areas. Livestock grazing use would be managed to provide for protection or enhancement of other resource values.

### **High Savery Dam Area**

The area would be cooperatively managed for recreational and multiple-use objectives and irrigation water, consistent with the June 2003 MOU between Wyoming Water Development Commission (WWDC) and BLM (Appendix 23). The area would be open to mineral leasing with a NSO stipulation.

For public safety and protection of structures and facilities, public access would be closed to vehicular travel. Public access would be restricted to foot travel only.

The WWDC would be responsible for water, wetland, and riparian management on the subject public lands, as required by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) Section 404 permit for the High Savery Dam and Reservoir Project. Management of these resources would be coordinated with the BLM.

The High Savery allotment would be open to livestock grazing to meet vegetative management goals and the objectives for the High Savery Dam and Reservoir Project area. Grazing use would be authorized on a temporary, nonrenewable basis.

### **Special Recreation Management Areas**

#### **Continental Divide National Scenic Trail SRMA**

The Continental Divide National Scenic Trail (600 acres; the federal portion of the trail consists of about 82 miles by 60 feet) would be managed to provide opportunities for trail users to view the diverse topographic, geographic, vegetative, wildlife, and scenic phenomena that characterize the Continental Divide and to observe examples of human use of the natural resources.

The special resource management area (SRMA) would be managed to protect the corridor. Land exchanges and easement acquisitions would be pursued to improve the continuity of the trail where opportunities arise. Kiosks would be erected at each end of the RMPPA portion of the trail to provide information on access to the trail.

The area would be open to oil and gas leasing with intensive management of surface-disturbing and disruptive activities.

#### **North Platte River Area**

Access opportunities to the North Platte River would be identified and pursued.

#### **Rawlins OHV Area**

The area would be closed to livestock grazing.

### **National Natural Landmarks**

Lands totaling 800 acres in the Big Hollow National Natural Landmark (NNL) and 160 acres in the Sand Creek NNL would be considered for disposal to individuals, organizations, agencies, or institutions that would manage these areas in accordance with their NNL status (Map 2-18).

## Encampment River Potential Wild and Scenic River

The Encampment River Potential Wild and Scenic River (WSR) (Map 2-19) would be managed to maintain or enhance the outstanding remarkable values and classification (Wild) (Appendix 3). This WSR falls entirely within the Encampment River WSA, which constrains the development of alternative interim management prescriptions. Interim management actions for the Encampment River that are common to all alternatives include—

- Temporary cultural and paleontological activities would be allowed on the public lands.
- Public lands would be closed to oil and gas leasing, and closed to locatable mineral entry and operation of the public land laws including sale. Withdrawals would be pursued.
- Public lands would be closed to recreational dredging, and to surface-disturbing and disruptive activities such as major recreational developments, ROWs. Some minor recreational developments such as hiking trails and signs would be allowed.
- Public lands would be closed to development of water impoundments, diversions, or hydroelectric power facilities.
- Public lands would be closed to motorized vehicles. Nonmotorized vehicles, e.g., bicycles, wheelchairs, game carts, would be restricted to existing trails.
- Public lands would be closed to commercial timber harvest.
- Range improvements and increases in grazing preference would not be allowed.
- Public lands would be managed as Visual Resource Management (VRM) Class I. The area would be designated an AMR fire suppression area.

### 2.3.12 Transportation and Access

The public land transportation system would be maintained or modified to provide for public health and safety and adequate access to public lands.

### 2.3.13 Vegetation

Under all alternatives, forage allocation on acquired lands would be consistent with the purpose of the acquisition and multiple-use objectives for the area.

Aspen stands would be managed to increase distribution and improve seral structure.

All forms of control for noxious and invasive weeds and pests would be allowed in the RMPPA on a case-by-case basis.

#### Special Status Plant Species and Habitat

Populations of special status species would be fenced to protect them from grazing, trailing, or other disturbance where needed. Known populations of special status plant species would be closed to locatable mineral entry and operation of the public land laws, including sale. Withdrawal would be pursued.

Known habitat for BLM Wyoming State sensitive plant species would be open to oil and gas leasing with intensive management of surface-disturbing and disruptive activities.

The fenced Gibben's beardtongue (*Penstemon gibbensii*) site (approximately 15 acres) would be maintained to protect the population from disturbance.

In unique plant communities, such as the Muddy Gap Cushion Plant Community area, notices would be required for locatable mineral exploration and development (except casual use) consistent with regulations. Intensive management actions would be taken to protect the unique plant communities where necessary. Unique plant communities would be closed to mineral material disposals.

Informal conferencing and consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) would occur for authorized activities that would potentially affect the habitat for endangered, threatened, proposed, and candidate plant species within the RMPPA (Appendix 10). The Statewide Programmatic Biological Assessments and Biological Opinions authorized for each plant species, including all the reasonable and prudent measures and terms and conditions would be implemented within the RMPPA.

### **2.3.14 Water Quality, Watershed, and Soils Management**

Activities that would cause new water depletion within the Colorado River system would comply with the Recovery Implementation Program for Endangered Fishes in the Upper Colorado River Basin (Appendix 11). Activities that would cause existing or new water depletion within the North Platte River system would comply with Intra-Service Consultations covering the recovery of endangered species in the Platte River (Appendix 11).

Intensive management of surface-disturbing and disruptive activities would be implemented in watersheds contributing to water bodies listed on the state's 303d list of water bodies with water quality impairments or threats.

#### **Surface Disturbance and Permanent Structures in Waterways**

Linear crossings, such as pipelines, utilities, or roads across waterbodies, wetlands, and/or ephemeral channels, would be considered on a case-by-case basis with intensive management to protect the above areas. Surface-disturbing activities would be avoided on unstable areas, such as landslides, slumps, and areas exhibiting soil creep.

#### **Muddy Creek Watershed (USGS HUC 14050004)**

Surface-disturbing activities would be intensively managed within those portions of the Muddy Creek drainage that contribute to degradation of reaches previously or currently listed on the 303d list (Map 2-20).

#### **Sage Creek Watershed (USGS HUC 101800209)**

Sage Creek Watershed, USGS HUC 101800209, is listed on the state 303d list for sediment contribution to the North Platte River. Surface-disturbing activities, vegetation treatments, and grazing management actions would be intensively managed to reduce sediment loading to the North Platte River (Map 2-20).

## 2.3.15 Wild Horses

Periodic (rather than annual) gathers will be the primary tools for population management in the Lost Creek, Adobe Town, and Stewart Creek HMAs.

Appendix 12 contains a detailed description of the development, application, and interpretation of appropriate management levels (AML) for the Rawlins HMAs. The AML for the Adobe Town HMA would remain at 700 adults; the AML for the Stewart Creek HMA would remain at 150 adults. These AMLs could change based on future monitoring.

## 2.3.16 Wildlife and Fisheries

BLM would cooperate with the Wyoming Game and Fish Department (WGFD) in considering and planning for the introduction, transplant, reestablishment, augmentation, and/or stocking of wildlife and fish species for nonthreatened and nonendangered species. BLM would also cooperate with the FWS and WGFD in considering and planning for the introduction, transplant, reestablishment, augmentation, and/or stocking of wildlife and fish species for threatened and endangered species.

Surface-disturbing and other activities would be intensively managed in all raptor concentration areas (RCA) to reduce physical disturbance of raptor habitat and disturbance to the birds. This would entail a case-by-case examination of proposals to determine potential effects and appropriate mitigation to minimize those effects.

Best management practices (BMP) (Appendix 13) would be applied to surface-disturbing and disruptive activities to maintain or enhance wildlife species and their habitats.

### **Endangered (E), Threatened (T), Proposed (P), and Candidate (C) Species**

Informal conferencing and consultation with the U.S. FWS would occur for authorized activities that would potentially affect the habitat for endangered, threatened, proposed, and candidate species within the RMPPA (Appendix 10). The Statewide Programmatic Biological Assessments and Biological Opinions authorized for each species, including all the reasonable and prudent measures and terms and conditions would be implemented for the RMPPA.

Threatened and endangered, candidate, and proposed species and habitat conservation measures identified in the biological assessment (BLM 2004b) will be adhered to for compliance with the Endangered Species Act (Appendix 14). These measures would be applied to all surface-disturbing and disruptive activities, as appropriate, to ensure compliance with Section 9 of the Endangered Species Act. The biological assessment for the RMP contains additional supporting information and rationale for the conservation measures. Some of these conservation measures are described in Appendix 14.

### **Other Special Status Species**

Surface-disturbing and disruptive activities that would potentially affect the habitat of other special status species would be considered on a case-by-case basis (Appendices 1 and 15).

Surface-disturbing and disruptive activities located in potential mountain plover habitat are prohibited during the reproductive period of April 10 to July 10 for the protection of breeding and nesting mountain plover. Additional protection measures would be applied if this area were later determined to be within occupied habitat (Appendix 16). Occupied habitat is defined as areas where broods and adults have been found in the current year or documented in at least 2 of the past 5 years.

## **2.4 ALTERNATIVE 1: NO ACTION—CONTINUATION OF EXISTING MANAGEMENT**

Alternative 1 is defined as a continuation of the current management direction. Ongoing programs initiated under existing legislation and regulations in the Great Divide RMP would continue. Thus, Alternative 1 describes the current resource and land use management direction in the RMPPA. Alternative 1 and its impact analysis represent the baseline to which the other management alternatives and their associated analyses are compared. Management actions proposed under Alternative 1 are presented in Table 2-1.

## **2.5 ALTERNATIVE 2: EMPHASIS ON DEVELOPMENT OF RESOURCES**

Alternative 2 provides expanded opportunities to use and develop resources found within the RMPPA. This alternative emphasizes development and intensive management, while placing less emphasis on environmental protection. Resources would be protected to the extent required by applicable laws and regulations. Development and activities would occur throughout the RMPPA as proposed through management actions consistent with existing BLM guidelines. Management actions proposed under Alternative 2 are presented in Table 2-1.

## **2.6 ALTERNATIVE 3: EMPHASIS ON PROTECTION OF RESOURCES**

Alternative 3 changes the mix of opportunities to use, develop, and manage resources. The alternative emphasizes the improvement and protection of habitat for wildlife and sensitive plant and animal species; improvement of riparian areas and water quality; preservation of the unique genetic phenotypes in the Lost Creek HMA; and protection of historic and cultural sites. Development of resources within the RMPPA would occur with intensive management of surface-disturbing and disruptive activities. Management actions proposed under Alternative 3 are presented in Table 2-1.

## **2.7 ALTERNATIVE 4: PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE**

The Preferred Alternative provides a balance of providing opportunities to use and develop resources within the RMPPA while ensuring environmental conservation. The preferred alternative provides the guidance that emphasizes both resource use and resource protection. This balanced alternative best meets the issues and concerns raised during scoping. The preferred alternative represents the management actions recommended by the Field Manager to the State Director as the actions that best resolve planning issues within the RMPPA and that best promote balanced multiple-use objectives. Management actions proposed under the Preferred Alternative are presented in Table 2-1.

## **2.8 COMPARATIVE SUMMARY OF IMPACTS**

Table 2-4 at the end of this chapter, provides a summary of the impacts of management actions proposed under each alternative, organized by resource or resource management program. The environmental consequences of the management actions proposed under each alternative are analyzed in Chapter 4.

## 2.9 MONITORING AND EVALUATION PLAN AND ACTIVITY PLAN WORKING GROUPS

### 2.9.1 Monitoring and Evaluation Plan

Management actions identified for the Rawlins RMPPA are based on studies and the best scientific and commercial information available. However, conditions may change during the term (20 years) of the land use plan. Experience has shown that implemented management actions can be improved, as new technology and new information become available. It is also possible that changes in land use will require a different management action to protect the resources. To address the changing conditions and provide management flexibility using BMP, the RFO will monitor and evaluate the approved plan using a process that provides the optimum means of checking the effectiveness of management actions. This process will measure the effectiveness of existing actions by monitoring these actions and applying the results of new scientific research. To do this, the process will analyze the current resource conditions resulting from implemented actions and identify and recommend alternatives or modified actions, as necessary, to reach established objectives and goals. Because capability to conduct the process at the optimum level can vary from year to year, the actions to be monitored will be prioritized.

Appendix 17 presents a description of the monitoring and evaluation plan to be implemented.

### 2.9.2 Activity Plan Working Groups

RMP decisions establish goals, objectives, and management actions for activities on public lands. Standard or BMP are identified in land use plans. Activity-level actions include implementation plans and analyses such as Allotment or Habitat Management Plans, Oil and Gas Field Development Plans, Recreation Management Plans, and Coordinated Activity Plans. These activity-level plans evaluate the sufficiency of RMP decisions and standard practices. They analyze the need to modify existing decisions and practices in light of proposed or projected resource use or activity.

BLM supports the formation of APWGs when circumstances dictate. Potential cooperating agencies in these working groups could assist BLM in the preparation of environmental analyses for activity-level actions or modifications to current plans. BLM or potential cooperating agencies may identify the need for activity planning and the associated APWG formation. This approach is similar to the process used by BLM and its cooperating agencies to develop this RMP.

The objectives of APWGs are to—

- Minimize controversy by being proactive rather than reactive to public land use and resource conflicts
- Provide effective and cost-efficient, consensus-based mitigation of resource conflicts
- Improve resource conditions by recommending practices and mitigation measures appropriate to special situations
- Streamline public land authorizations, increase implementation flexibility, and notify public land users of required practices.

The recommendation to establish an APGW commits BLM to meet with potential cooperating agencies prior to scoping for major activity plans or RMP amendments to establish the level and extent of the involvement of APGWs. Examples of issues potentially requiring formation of an APGW include—

- OHV use escalating to a significant issue
- Activity level approaching that contained in the impact analyses made from reasonable foreseeable actions in an RMP or previous activity plan analysis
- Proposals for oil and gas surface location densities or acres disturbed above a certain amount per unit area
- Identification of the need to prepare a Recreation Management Activity Plan
- Significant change to assumptions used for impact analysis in an RMP.

Examples of resource locations or management situations in which activity or use may trigger working group formation include:

- Where crucial or important wildlife habitats overlap with areas of high potential for surface disturbance (e.g., where WGFD has identified crucial deer winter range or other important habitats and high intensity oil and gas development areas overlap)
- Wildland urban interfaces
- Where two or more resources of interest to cooperating agencies are in conflict (e.g., significant surface disturbance in identified habitat for threatened and endangered or state sensitive species).

When an APWG is convened, objectives include—

- Establishing working group membership and organization. Examples of existing working groups are found in the Continental Divide/Wamsutter II Wildlife Protection Plan (ROD, page 15 and App. D, May 2000) or the Powder River Basin Interagency Work Groups (ROD, page 11, April 2003).
- Identifying issues, practices, and management actions the working group should address.
- Establishing mechanisms and processes for communicating recommendations to BLM.
- Identifying public involvement and notification needs associated with working group activities.

Other attributes and functions of APWGs are—

- APWGs will be specific to the activity plan.
- APWGs will provide suggestions and recommendations to BLM for evaluating mitigation, reclamation, and habitat management practices (e.g., off-site mitigation, compensation mitigation, and a mitigation account, in addition to specific practices [Appendix 18]).

**Table 2-1. Summary Comparison of Alternatives**

	Alternative 1	AIR QUALITY			Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)
		Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	
<b>Management Goals</b>					
To maintain or enhance air quality levels and, within the scope of BlM's authority, minimize emissions that may add to acid rain, cause violations of air quality standards, or degraded visibility.	Same as Alternative 1.				
To protect public health and safety and the well being of sensitive natural resources.	Same as Alternative 1.				
<b>Management Actions</b>					
Management actions for air quality management are common to all alternatives because of specific limitations on management of resources (e.g., various laws and regulations) that guided the development of the management alternatives. Management actions common to all alternatives are presented in Section 2.3.					
<b>CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>					
	Alternative 1	CULTURAL RESOURCES			Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)
		Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	
<b>Management Goals</b>					
To ensure opportunities for scientific, educational, recreational, and traditional uses of cultural resources by present and future generations.	Same as Alternative 1.				
To resolve conflicts between cultural resources and other resource values and land use activities.	Same as Alternative 1.				
To design cultural resource management actions to maintain the value appropriate to each cultural resource.	Same as Alternative 1.				

CULTURAL RESOURCES				
	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)
<b>Management Actions by Alternative</b>				
Land acquisitions would be pursued to preserve cultural resources, as appropriate.	Land acquisitions would be considered to preserve cultural resources, on a case-by-case basis as opportunities arise.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
An area within ¼ mile of a cultural property or the visual horizon, whichever is closer, would be an avoidance area for surface disturbing and disruptive activities, if the setting contributes to NRHP eligibility (Appendix 5).			Surface disturbing activities would not be allowed within ¼ mile of a cultural property or the visual horizon, whichever is closer, if the setting contributes to NRHP eligibility (Appendix 5).	Same as Alternative 3.
FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT				
	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)
<b>Management Goals</b>				
To protect human life, property, communities at risk, and other communities and enhance and protect the public land resources through fuels management, AMR, and use of wildland fire for resource benefit.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
To complement and support state and local wildland fire actions through AMR and use of wildland fire for resource benefit.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
To manage fire to restore natural ecosystem functions, reduce losses from catastrophic wildland fire, and protect multiple-use values.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.

FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)
<b>Management Actions by Alternative</b>			
Wildland fire suppression activities in the entire RMPPA would be managed for AMR. Wildland fire for resource benefit would be used to protect, maintain, and enhance resources and, as nearly as possible, allow fire to function in its natural ecological role. Use of wildland fire would be based on the current Federal Wildland Fire Management Policy and the Southern Wyoming Zone Fire Management Plan.	With the exception of some SMAs (see Map 2-1 and SMA section of this table), emphasis would be placed on the suppression of all wildfires, regardless of ignition source.	With the exception of WUIs, some ACECs, and other SMAs, the use of wildland fire for resource benefit would be emphasized for all natural ignitions.	Same as Alternative 1.
<b>FORESTRY</b>			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)
<b>Management Goals</b>			
To enhance ecological health and productivity and the species diversity of the forestlands through forest management practices.	To enhance health and productivity of the commercial forestlands through forest management practices.	To allow forest succession to occur with minimal human intervention that would comply with the Healthy Forest Initiative.	Same as Alternative 1.
<b>Management Actions by Alternative</b>			
All forests and woodlands in the Resource Management Plan Planning Area (RMPPA) (111,400 acres) would be managed to meet forest health objectives.	Same as Alternative 1.	Forest health goals would be met only through management actions designed to promote forest health.	Same as Alternative 1.
Forests and woodlands would be managed using natural processes; prescribed fire; and chemical, mechanical, and biological treatments (Appendix 19).	Forests and woodlands would be managed using prescribed fire, and chemical, mechanical, and biological treatments (Appendix 19).	Forests and woodlands would be managed with emphasis on natural processes (Appendix 19).	Same as Alternative 1.

<b>FORESTRY</b>			
<b>Alternative 1</b>	<b>Alternative 2</b>	<b>Alternative 3</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)</b>
About 25,900 acres of commercial forest in the RMPPA would be available for commercial timber harvest.	Same as Alternative 1.	No forestlands would be available for commercial timber harvest; management actions on 25,900 acres of commercial forestlands would be allowed to enhance forest health and meet public demand for minor wood products.	About 19,200 acres of commercial forest in the RMPPA would be available for commercial timber harvest.
Of the 25,900 acres, about 6,700 acres have steep slopes and riparian areas and associated buffer zones, which would require that additional restrictions and/or mitigation measures be applied to timber harvest actions in these areas.	Same as Alternative 1.	Forestlands would be available for management actions designed to promote forest health.	About 6,700 acres of steep slopes and riparian areas and their associated buffer zones would not be available for commercial timber harvest.
<b>LANDS AND REALTY</b>			
<b>Alternative 1</b>	<b>Alternative 2</b>	<b>Alternative 3</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)</b>
<b>Management Goals</b>			
To support the goals and objectives of other resource programs for managing BLM-administered public lands and to respond to public demand for land use authorizations.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
To improve management efficiency in areas of scattered or intermingled land ownership patterns and to respond to community needs for expansion and economic development.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.

		LANDS AND REALTY	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)
<b>Management Actions by Alternative</b>					
<b>Withdrawals</b>	Proposed withdrawals of about 7,660 acres would be pursued. These areas would be closed to operation of the public land laws, including disposal, and to mineral location under the mining laws (Table 2-2).	Proposed withdrawals of about 8,390 acres would be pursued. These areas would be closed to operation of the public land laws, including disposal, and to mineral location under the mining laws (Table 2-2).	Proposed withdrawals of about 272,350 acres would be pursued. These areas would be closed to operation of the public land laws, including disposal, and to mineral location under the mining laws (Table 2-2).	Proposed withdrawals of about 14,450 acres would be pursued. These areas would be closed to operation of the public land laws, including disposal, and to mineral location under the mining laws (Table 2-2).	Proposed withdrawals of about 14,450 acres would be pursued. These areas would be closed to operation of the public land laws, including disposal, and to mineral location under the mining laws (Table 2-2).
<b>Land Tenure Adjustment</b>	About 61,010 acres of BLM-administered public lands would meet the FLPMA disposal criteria and would be available for consideration for disposal (Maps 2-22 through 2-25 and Appendix 6). Before taking any disposal action, consideration would be given to each individual tract and would include public involvement (Appendix 6).	About 46,230 acres of BLM-administered public lands meet the FLPMA disposal criteria and would be available for consideration for disposal (Maps 2-26 through 2-29 and Appendix 6).	Same as Alternative 1.	No specific tracts would be considered for disposal.	Same as Alternative 2.
<b>Energy Development and Exploration Management Actions</b>	The preferred method of disposal, consolidation, or acquisition of lands by BLM would be through exchange.	There would be no preferred method of disposal.	No specific tracts would be considered for disposal.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
	The area within $\frac{1}{4}$ mile of the incorporated boundaries of all cities/towns (1,500 total acres) would be open to oil and gas leasing with intensive management.		The area within $\frac{1}{2}$ mile of the incorporated boundaries of all cities/towns (4,500 total acres) would be open to oil and gas leasing with an NSO stipulation. Existing oil and gas leases would be intensively managed.	The area within $\frac{1}{4}$ mile of the incorporated boundaries of all cities/towns (1,500 acres) would be open to oil and gas leasing with an NSO stipulation. Existing oil and gas leases would be intensively managed.	

		LANDS AND REALTY	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)
Alternative	Alternative 2			
The area within $\frac{1}{4}$ mile of the incorporated boundaries of all cities/towns (1,500 total acres) would be open to locatable mineral entry, mineral material disposals, and operation of the applicable public land laws, including sale, with intensive surface management.	Same as Alternative 1.	The area within $\frac{1}{2}$ mile of the incorporated boundaries of all cities/towns (4,500 total acres) would be closed to locatable mineral entry and mineral material disposals. Withdrawals would be pursued.	The area within $\frac{1}{4}$ mile of the incorporated boundaries of all cities/towns (1,500 acres) would be closed to locatable mineral entry and mineral material disposals. Withdrawals would be pursued.	The area within $\frac{1}{2}$ mile of the incorporated boundaries of all cities/towns (1,500 acres) would be closed to locatable mineral entry and mineral material disposals. Withdrawals would be pursued.
<b>Alternative Energy Development–Wind Energy Resources Management Actions</b>	Wind energy development would not be allowed in avoidance areas identified on Map 2-30.	Wind energy development would not be allowed in avoidance areas identified on Map 2-31.	Wind energy development would not be allowed in avoidance areas identified on Map 2-32.	Wind energy development would not be allowed in avoidance areas identified on Map 2-33.
<b>Utility/Transportation Systems Management Actions</b>	Areas with important resource values would be avoided where possible in planning for new facility placement. If it becomes necessary for facilities (i.e., linear ROWs) to be placed within avoidance areas, effects would be intensively managed (Table 2-5 at the end of this chapter). Avoidance areas are identified on Map 2-30.	Same as Alternative 1, except as indicated by avoidance and exclusion areas (Table 2-5 at the end of this chapter). Avoidance areas are identified on Map 2-31.	Areas with important resource values would be closed to new facility placement and routes (Table 2-5 at the end of this chapter). Avoidance areas are identified on Map 2-32.	Same as Alternative 1.
<b>Communication Sites Management Actions</b>	Location of new communication sites would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.	Same as Alternative 1.	BLM would require co-location of communication sites and would restrict new cell towers or communication sites to existing, designated communication sites.	Same as Alternative 1.
	Areas with important resource values would be avoided where possible in planning for new facility placement and routes. If it becomes necessary for facilities to be placed within avoidance areas, effects would be intensively managed.	Same as Alternative 1.	Avoidance and exclusion areas identified in Table 2-5 would be closed to new facility placement and routes.	Same as Alternative 1.

		LIVESTOCK GRAZING		
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)	
<b>Management Goal by Alternative</b>				
<p>To enhance livestock grazing while maintaining a balance between other economic uses and wildlife habitat and watershed and riparian areas while maintaining or improving range condition.</p>				
<b>Management Actions by Alternative</b>				
<p><b>General</b></p> <p>BLM would work closely with operators to determine the most appropriate methods for achieving the Standards.</p> <p>Grazing systems and range improvements would be implemented to maximize livestock production while maintaining other resource values.</p> <p>Changes in class of livestock within HMAs would be considered.</p> <p>Conversions from cattle or sheep to domestic bison would be considered in all areas.</p>				
To enhance livestock grazing while maintaining a balance between other economic uses and wildlife habitat and watershed and riparian areas while maintaining or improving range condition.	Same as Alternative 1.	To maintain livestock grazing and a balance between other economic uses and wildlife habitat and watershed and riparian areas while maintaining or improving range condition.	Livestock grazing will be managed in a compatible balance with other economic uses, wildlife habitat, and watershed and riparian areas while maintaining or improving range condition and achieving rangeland standards.	Same as Alternative 3.
<b>Vacant Grazing Allotments</b>				
<p>Livestock grazing use on public lands in vacant grazing allotments is a discretionary action.</p> <p>The following area, as identified in the SMA section, would be recognized as a vacant allotment and would be grazed only on a temporary, non-renewable basis:</p>				
	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Livestock grazing use on public lands in vacant grazing allotments is a discretionary action.	Same as Alternative 3.
			The following areas, as identified in the SMA section, would be recognized as vacant allotments and would be grazed only on a temporary, non-renewable basis:	

<b>LIVESTOCK GRAZING</b>			
<b>Alternative 1</b>	<b>Alternative 2</b>	<b>Alternative 3</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)</b>
• High Savery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chain Lakes</li> <li>• Pennock</li> <li>• High Savery</li> </ul> <p>Allotments may be added or removed from this list as the situation warrants.</p>		
<b>Fences</b>			
New fence construction would be authorized according to BLM standards. Existing fences would be modified according to current BLM standards where needed or as older fences are reconstructed (Appendix 19).	Same as Alternative 1.	New fence construction would be authorized according to BLM standards. Existing fences would be modified according to current BLM standards (Appendix 19).	Same as Alternative 1.
No similar action.	No similar action.	In those areas where BLM standard fence is not adequate to control domestic sheep use, herding would be required.	Same as Alternative 3.
<b>MINERALS</b>			
<b>Alternative 1</b>	<b>Alternative 2</b>	<b>Alternative 3</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)</b>
<b>Management Goals by Alternative</b>			
To provide opportunities for leasing, exploration, and development of minerals and oil and gas while protecting other resource values.	Emphasize leasing, exploration, and development of minerals and oil and gas while maintaining other resource values to the extent possible.	Provide opportunities for leasing, exploration, and development of minerals and oil and gas while providing enhanced protection for other resource values.	Same as Alternative 1.
<b>Management Actions by Alternative</b>			
<b>Oil and Gas</b>			
<i>Oil and Gas Classification A.</i> Areas open to leasing, subject to the terms and conditions of the standard lease form.	1,382,470 acres of federal oil and gas leasable lands, presented in Map 2-36, would be open to leasing consideration and subject to standard lease stipulations (Appendix 20).	1,382,470 acres of federal oil and gas leasable lands, presented in Map 2-37, would be open to leasing consideration and subject to standard lease stipulations (Appendix 20).	853,690 acres of federal oil and gas leasable lands, presented on Map 2-38, would be open to leasing consideration and subject to standard lease stipulations (Appendix 20).

		MINERALS		
Alternative 1		Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)
<b>Oil and Gas Classification B.</b> Areas open to leasing, subject to minor constraints such as seasonal restrictions. These are areas where it has been determined that moderately restrictive lease stipulations may be required to mitigate impacts on other land uses or resource values.	3,321,600 acres of federal oil and gas leasable lands, presented in Map 2-35, would be open to leasing consideration and subject to lease stipulations, such as seasonal restrictions.	2,880,710 acres of federal oil and gas leasable lands, presented in Map 2-36, would be open to leasing consideration and subject to lease stipulations, such as seasonal restrictions (i.e., Endangered Species Act [ESA] and Migratory Bird Treaty Act [MBTA] species).	2,407,810 acres of federal oil and gas leasable lands, presented in Map 2-37, would be open to leasing consideration and subject to lease stipulations, such as seasonal restrictions.	3,279,670 acres of federal oil and gas leasable lands, presented in Map 2-38, would be open to leasing consideration and subject to lease stipulations, such as seasonal restrictions.
<b>Oil and Gas Classification C.</b> Areas open to leasing, subject to major constraints such as NSO stipulations on an area more than 40 acres or more than 1/4 mile wide. In these areas, it has been determined that highly restrictive lease stipulations are required to mitigate impacts on other lands or resource values. This category also includes areas where overlapping minor constraints would severely limit development of fluid mineral resources.	343,140 acres of federal oil and gas leasable lands, presented in Map 2-35, would be open to leasing consideration and subject to lease stipulations such as NSO.	258,110 acres of federal oil and gas leasable lands, presented in Map 2-36, would be open to leasing consideration and subject to lease stipulations such as NSO.	1,417,630 acres of federal oil and gas leasable lands, presented in Map 2-37, would be open to leasing consideration and subject to lease stipulations such as NSO.	377,590 acres of federal oil and gas leasable lands, presented in Map 2-38, would be open to leasing consideration and subject to lease stipulations such as NSO.
<b>Oil and Gas Classification D.</b> Areas closed to leasing. These are areas where it has been determined that other land uses or resource values cannot be adequately protected with even the most restrictive lease stipulations; appropriate protection can be ensured only by closing the lands to leasing.	66,120 acres of federal oil and gas leasable lands, presented in Map 2-35, would be closed to leasing.	66,610 acres of federal oil and gas leasable lands, presented in Map 2-36, would be closed to leasing.	120,360 acres of federal oil and gas leasable lands, presented in Map 2-37, would be closed to leasing.	76,950 acres of federal oil and gas leasable lands, presented in Map 2-38, would be closed to leasing.
<b>General Protection Requirements</b>	Surface disturbing activities would be intensively managed. Leases would be issued with stipulations to protect resource values. Oil and gas stipulations for each oil and gas classification are presented in Table 2-6 at the end of this chapter (Map 2-35).	Surface disturbing activities would be intensively managed. Leases would be issued with stipulations to protect resource values. Oil and gas stipulations for each oil and gas classification are presented in Table 2-6 at the end of this chapter (Map 2-37).	Surface disturbing activities would be intensively managed. Leases would be issued with stipulations to protect resource values. Oil and gas stipulations for each oil and gas classification are presented in Table 2-6 at the end of this chapter (Map 2-37).	Surface disturbing activities would be intensively managed. Leases would be issued with stipulations to protect resource values. Oil and gas stipulations for each oil and gas classification are presented in Table 2-6 at the end of this chapter (Map 2-38).
<b>Locatable Minerals</b>	About 7,660 acres would be withdrawn from locatable mineral entry under proposed withdrawals (Table 2-2 and Map 2-4).	About 8,390 acres would be withdrawn from locatable mineral entry under proposed withdrawals (Table 2-2 and Map 2-39).	About 272,350 acres would be withdrawn from locatable mineral entry under proposed withdrawals (Table 2-2 and Map 2-40).	About 14,450 acres would be withdrawn from locatable mineral entry under proposed withdrawals (Table 2-2 and Map 2-41).

		MINERALS		
	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)
Plans of operation would be required for locatable minerals activities that would cause surface disturbance (except casual use) regardless of the size of the disturbance for the following ACECs (Map 2-7):	No similar action.	Plans of operation would be required for locatable minerals activities that would cause surface disturbance (except casual use) regardless of the size of the disturbance for the following ACECs (Map 2-8):	Plans of operation would be required for locatable minerals activities that would cause surface disturbance (except casual use) regardless of the size of the disturbance for the following ACECs (Map 2-9):	Plans of operation would be required for locatable minerals activities that would cause surface disturbance (except casual use) regardless of the size of the disturbance for the following ACECs (Map 2-9):
			Historic Trails 66,260 ac	Sand Hills ACEC 12,700 ac
Como Bluff ACEC 1,690 ac	Sand Hills ACEC 7,960 ac	Jep Canyon ACEC 13,810 ac	Shamrock Hills ACEC 18,400 ac	
OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLE USE				
	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)
<b>Management Goals by Alternative</b>		Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
To ensure the continued availability of OHV opportunities, to meet legal requirements for the health and safety of visitors, and to mitigate conflicts with other resource uses.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	To provide more regulated opportunities for motorized recreation experiences while enhancing protection of other resources from excessive disturbance, road/route/trail proliferation, and human encroachment.	Same as Alternative 3.
To provide opportunities for motorized recreation experiences while protecting other resources from excessive disturbance, road/route/trail proliferation, and human encroachment.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	To allow legitimate OHV use where possible and provide additional protection to identified sensitive resources.	Same as Alternative 3.
To allow OHV use where possible and provide adequate protection to identified sensitive resources.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.		

OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLE USE			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)
<b>Management Actions by Alternative</b>			
<b>Motorized Vehicle Use</b>			
Motorized vehicle use in the Dune Ponds Cooperative Management Area (3,730 acres) would be limited to existing roads and vehicle routes on vegetated portions of the area. The nonvegetated sand areas of the active dunes would be open to OHV use.	Same as Alternative 1.	The entire Dune Ponds Cooperative Management Area (3,730 acres) would be closed to OHV use.	Same as Alternative 1.
OHV use to retrieve big game kills would be allowed off existing roads and vehicle routes.	Same as Alternative 1.	OHV use to retrieve big game kills would be limited to roads and vehicle routes, except where roads and vehicle routes are closed.	OHV use to retrieve big game kills would be allowed within 300 feet of existing roads and vehicle routes, except where roads and vehicle routes are closed.
OHV use to access camping sites would be allowed off existing roads and vehicle routes.	Same as Alternative 1.	OHV use to access camping sites would be limited to roads and vehicle routes, except where roads and vehicle routes are closed.	OHV use to access camping sites would be limited to within 300 feet of existing roads and vehicle routes, except where roads and vehicle routes are closed.
3,730 acres would be open to OHV use (Map 2-5 and Appendix 21). 2,222,330 acres would be limited to either designated or existing roads and vehicle routes.	4,210 acres would be open to OHV use (Map 2-42 and Appendix 21). 2,221,981 acres would be limited to either designated or existing roads and vehicle routes.	2,167,290 acres would be limited to either designated or existing roads and vehicle routes.	3,730 acres would be open to OHV use (Map 2-44 and Appendix 21).
1,284,490 acres would be limited to existing roads and vehicle routes (within the checkerboard or other intermixed landownership areas). 23,020 acres would be closed to OHV use.	1,284,970 acres would be limited to existing roads and vehicle routes (within the checkerboard or other intermixed landownership areas). 23,020 acres would be closed to OHV use.	71,980 acres would be closed to OHV use.	2,201,510 acres would be limited to either designated or existing roads and vehicle routes.
No similar action.	No similar action.	13,180 acres would be limited to designated roads and vehicle routes and closed to over-the-snow vehicles (Map 2-43 and Appendix 21).	1,284,970 acres would be limited to existing roads and vehicle routes (within the checkerboard or other intermixed landownership areas). 34,030 acres would be closed to OHV use.
			13,180 acres would be limited to designated roads and vehicle routes and closed to over-the-snow vehicles (Map 2-44 and Appendix 21).

<b>OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLE USE</b>			
<b>Alternative 1</b>	<b>Alternative 2</b>	<b>Alternative 3</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)</b>
17,910 acres would be seasonally closed to OHV use (Map 2-5 and Appendix 21).	Same as Alternative 1 (Map 2-42 and Appendix 21).	14,060 acres would be seasonally closed to OHV use (Map 2-43 and Appendix 21).	Same as Alternative 3 (Map 2-44 and Appendix 21).
Road densities would not be restricted.	Same as Alternative 1.	Road densities would not be allowed to exceed levels that diminish or adversely affect other resources or resource values.	Road density would be considered during the analysis process and authorization of surface disturbing and disruptive activities.
<b>PALEONTOLOGY</b>			
<b>Alternative 1</b>	<b>Alternative 2</b>	<b>Alternative 3</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)</b>
<b>Management Goals by Alternative</b>			
To maintain the integrity of the scientific value of paleontological resources.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
<b>Management Actions</b>			
Note: This section of the table presents actions for the management of paleontological resources. Management actions for the Como Bluff ACEC are located in the SMA section of this table.			
Management actions for paleontology are common to all alternatives because of specific limitations on management of resources (e.g., various laws and regulations) that guided the development of the management alternatives. Management actions common to all alternatives are presented in Section 2.3.			
<b>RECREATION RESOURCES</b>			
<b>Alternative 1</b>	<b>Alternative 2</b>	<b>Alternative 3</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)</b>
<b>Management Goals by Alternative</b>			
To ensure the continued availability and accessibility of outdoor recreational opportunities, to meet legal requirements for the health and safety of visitors, and to mitigate conflicts with other resource uses.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.

		RECREATION RESOURCES		
	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)
To manage recreation values to accommodate existing uses, prevent or mitigate environmental degradation resulting from recreation and other uses, and provide for the anticipated recreation uses and use levels in the RMPPA.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
<b>Management Actions by Alternative</b>				
Developed and undeveloped recreation sites (9,660 acres) would be open to oil and gas leasing with an NSO stipulation. Surface disturbance would be intensively managed in the $\frac{1}{4}$ -mile area surrounding these sites (an additional 7,930 acres).	Same as Alternative 1.	Developed and undeveloped recreation sites (9,660 acres) and the surrounding $\frac{1}{4}$ -mile area (an additional 15,800 acres) would be open to oil and gas leasing with an NSO stipulation.	Developed and undeveloped recreation sites (9,660 acres) would be closed to locatable mineral entry, mineral material disposals, and operation of the public land laws, including sale. Withdrawals would be pursued. Within the $\frac{1}{2}$ -mile area surrounding these sites (18,540 additional acres), surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be intensively managed. Buried utilities would be allowed with adequate reclamation of the surface. Above ground facilities would be avoided unless adequately mitigated to protect the recreation site viewshed.	Developed and undeveloped recreation sites (9,660 acres) would be closed to locatable mineral entry, mineral material disposals, and operation of the public land laws, including sale. Withdrawals would be pursued. Within the $\frac{1}{4}$ -mile area surrounding these sites (7,930 additional acres), surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be intensively managed. Buried utilities would be allowed with adequate reclamation of the surface. Above ground facilities would be avoided unless adequately mitigated to protect the recreation site viewshed.
The west end of the Ferris Mountains (5,270 acres) (Map 2-45) would be managed for multiple use.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	The west end of the Ferris Mountains (5,270 acres) (Map 2-45) would be managed to preserve naturalness and opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation.	Same as Alternative 3.

RECREATION RESOURCES				
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)	
The west end of the Ferris Mountains would be open to operation of public land laws, including sale.	Same as Alternative 1.	The west end of the Ferris Mountains would be closed to operation of the public land laws, including sale. Withdrawals would be pursued.	Same as Alternative 3.	
The west end of the Ferris Mountains would be open to locatable mineral entry.	Same as Alternative 1.	The west end of the Ferris Mountains would be closed to locatable mineral entry. Withdrawals from locatable mineral entry would be pursued.	Same as Alternative 3.	
The west end of the Ferris Mountains would be open to mineral material disposals.	Same as Alternative 1.	The west end of the Ferris Mountains would be closed to mineral material disposals.	Same as Alternative 3.	
The west end of the Ferris Mountains would be open to oil and gas leasing with intensive management of surface disturbing and disruptive activities.	Same as Alternative 1.	The west end of the Ferris Mountains would be closed to oil and gas leasing. Surface disturbing activities on existing leases would be intensively managed to preserve naturalness in the area.	Same as Alternative 3.	
The west end of the Ferris Mountains would be designated as an AMR fire suppression area.	Same as Alternative 1.	The west end of the Ferris Mountains would be designated as an AMR fire suppression area. Use of heavy equipment in this area would be limited.	Same as Alternative 3.	
Off-road vehicular travel for "necessary tasks" would be allowed in the west end of the Ferris Mountains.	Same as Alternative 1.	Off-road vehicular travel for "necessary tasks" would not be allowed in the west end of the Ferris Mountains.	Same as Alternative 3.	
The Adobe Town fringe areas (31,510 acres) (Map 2-45) would be managed for multiple use.	Same as Alternative 1.	The Adobe Town fringe areas (31,510 acres) (Map 2-45) would be managed to preserve naturalness and opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation.	Same as Alternative 1.	
The Adobe Town fringe areas would be open to operation of public land laws, including sale.	Same as Alternative 1.	The Adobe Town fringe areas would be closed to operation of public land laws, including sale. Withdrawals would be pursued.	Same as Alternative 1.	

<b>RECREATION RESOURCES</b>			
<b>Alternative 1</b>	<b>Alternative 2</b>	<b>Alternative 3</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)</b>
The Adobe Town fringe areas would be open to locatable mineral entry.	Same as Alternative 1.	The Adobe Town fringe areas would be closed to locatable mineral entry. Withdrawals from locatable mineral entry would be pursued.	Same as Alternative 1.
The Adobe Town fringe areas would be open to mineral material disposals.	Same as Alternative 1.	The Adobe Town fringe areas would be closed to mineral material disposals.	Same as Alternative 1.
The Adobe Town fringe areas would be open to oil and gas leasing with intensive management of surface disturbing and disruptive activities.	Same as Alternative 1.	The Adobe Town fringe areas would be closed to oil and gas leasing. Surface disturbing and disruptive activities on existing leases would be intensively managed to preserve the naturalness of the area.	Same as Alternative 1.
The Adobe Town fringe areas would be designated as an AMR fire suppression area.	Same as Alternative 1.	The Adobe Town fringe areas would be designated as an AMR fire suppression area. Use of heavy equipment in this area would be limited.	Same as Alternative 1.
Off-road vehicular travel for "necessary tasks" would be allowed in the Adobe Town fringe areas.	Same as Alternative 1.	Off-road vehicular travel for "necessary tasks" would not be allowed in the Adobe Town fringe areas.	Same as Alternative 1.
<b>SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREAS</b>			
<b>Management Goals by Alternative</b>	<b>Alternative 2</b>	<b>Alternative 3</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)</b>
To maintain and protect the integrity of unique resource values, preserve historic significance, and provide opportunity for other uses where appropriate.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
Manage WSAs according to the Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review to retain their suitability for designation as wilderness.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.

<b>SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREAS</b>			
<b>Alternative 1</b>	<b>Alternative 2</b>	<b>Alternative 3</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)</b>
To maintain or enhance the outstandingly remarkable values of waterway segments in the RMPPA that meet the WSR suitability factors until Congress decides whether to include the suitable waterway in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System (NWSRS).	No similar action.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
<b>Note: A summary of special management designations and the associated acreages by alternative are presented in Table 2-7. Appendix 22 presents an overview of BLM's ACEC designation process.</b>			
<b>Wilderness Study Areas</b>			
<b>Management Actions by Alternative</b>			
Motorized vehicle use in the Adobe Town WSA (34,220 acres) would be limited to designated roads and vehicle routes (Map 2-6).	Same as Alternative 1.	The Adobe Town WSA would be closed to OHV use (34,220 acres) (Map 2-6).	Same as Alternative 1.
The Prospect Mountain (1,150 acres) and Bennett Mountains (5,960 acres) WSAs would be open to all types of motorized use on existing roads and vehicle routes that were present before 1980, when WSAs were established. The Encampment River Canyon WSA (4,510 acres) would be open to all types of motorized use on existing roads and vehicle routes that were present before the establishment of the WSA, from May 1 to November 30, and closed to all motorized vehicles from December 1 to April 30 (Map 2-6).	Same as Alternative 1.	The Prospect Mountain (about 1,150 acres), Encampment River Canyon (about 4,510 acres), and Bennett Mountains (about 5,960 acres) WSAs would be closed to all types of motorized vehicle use (Map 2-6).	Same as Alternative 3.
<b>Management of Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC)</b>			
<b>Como Bluff ACEC/NNL</b>			
<b>Management Goals by Alternative</b>			
To protect the integrity of the paleontological values and the historical context of the area.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.

<b>SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREAS</b>			
<b>Management Actions by Alternative</b>	<b>Alternative 1</b>	<b>Alternative 2</b>	<b>Alternative 3</b>
			<b>Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)</b>
The Como Bluff NNL/ACEC designation (1,690 acres) (Map 2-7) would be retained.	The Como Bluff ACEC designation would be terminated, and would be managed as a NNL.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 2.
The Como Bluff NNL would be open to oil and gas leasing with intensive management of surface disturbing and disruptive activities within ¼ mile of exposures of the Morrison Formation.	The Como Bluff NNL would be open to oil and gas leasing.	The Como Bluff ACEC would be open to oil and gas leasing with an NSO stipulation on new leases. Surface disturbing activities on existing leases would be intensively managed.	Same as Alternative 1.
Plans of operations would be required for locatable mineral exploration and development (except casual use), regardless of the number of acres that may be disturbed.	Plans of operations would be required for locatable mineral exploration and development (except casual use) for surface disturbances of five acres or more.	Public lands would be closed to locatable mineral entry and operation of the public land laws, including sale. Withdrawals would be pursued.	Same as Alternative 2.
Those areas open to locatable mineral entry would also be open to mineral material disposals.	Same as Alternative 1.	Those areas closed to locatable mineral entry would also be closed to mineral material disposals.	The area would be open to mineral material disposals.
No similar action.	No similar action.	As opportunities arise, acquisition of adjacent lands or easements to improve public access would be considered and evaluated.	Same as Alternative 3.
Off-road vehicular travel for “necessary tasks” would be allowed (OHV definition in the Glossary).	Same as Alternative 1.	Off-road vehicular travel for “necessary tasks” would not be allowed (OHV definition in the Glossary). Exceptions may be authorized on a case-by-case basis following environmental analysis.	Same as Alternative 1.
<b>Sand Hills ACEC and Potential JO Ranch Expansion</b>			
<b>Management Goals by Alternative</b>			
To manage the resources in the Sand Hills ACEC to protect the unique vegetation community complex, to maintain wildlife habitat values, to minimize soil erosion, and to promote recreational opportunities.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.

<b>SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREAS</b>			
<b>Alternative 1</b>	<b>Alternative 2</b>	<b>Alternative 3</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)</b>
No similar action.	No similar action.	To manage and protect the JO Ranch for historical and cultural values that meets the needs of preserving a cultural way of life in the region from early ranching to the present.	Same as Alternative 3.
<b>Management Actions by Alternative<sup>1</sup></b>			
The Sand Hills ACEC (Map 2-7, 7,960 acres) designation would be retained.	The Sand Hills ACEC designation would be terminated, and would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
No similar action.	No similar action.	The existing ACEC boundaries would be expanded to include the JO Ranch acquisition (4,740 acres in expansion, for 12,700 total acres) (Map 2-8).	Same as Alternative 3 (Map 2-9).
No similar action.	The JO Ranch buildings and related facilities would not be stabilized. Signs would be placed to allow for the protection of public health and safety.	The JO Ranch buildings and related facilities would be stabilized to protect the integrity of the site and provide for public health and safety.	Same as Alternative 3.
The area would be open to federal oil and gas leasing with intensive management of surface disturbing and disruptive activities.	Same as Alternative 1.	The area would be closed to new federal oil and gas leasing. Surface disturbing activities on existing leases would be intensively managed to meet the objectives of the ACEC.	The area would be open to federal oil and gas leasing. Surface disturbing activities on oil and gas leases would be intensively managed to meet the objectives of the ACEC.
Plans of operations would be required for locatable federal mineral exploration and development (except casual use), regardless of the number of acres that may be disturbed.	Plans of operations would be required for locatable federal mineral exploration and development (except casual use), for surface disturbances of five acres or more.	Public lands would be closed to locatable mineral entry and operation of the public land laws, including sale. Withdrawals would be pursued.	Same as Alternative 1.
Those areas open to locatable mineral entry would also be open to mineral material disposals.	Same as Alternative 1.	Those areas closed to locatable mineral entry would also be closed to mineral material disposals.	Same as Alternative 1.

<sup>1</sup> The JO Ranch exchange is pending; however, management actions are provided in this plan with the understanding that the exchange will be completed before issuance of the ROD for the Rawlins RMP. If the exchange is not completed by the time the ROD is issued, the ROD would be drafted such that any decisions for the JO Ranch would not take effect until the Pittsburg and Midway Coal Mining Company (P&M) exchange is completed.

<b>SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREAS</b>			
<b>Alternative 1</b>	<b>Alternative 2</b>	<b>Alternative 3</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)</b>
No similar action.	No similar action.	Big game seasonal closures to motor vehicle use would be implemented as needed.	Same as Alternative 3.
Off-road vehicular travel for “necessary tasks” would be allowed (OHV definition in the Glossary).	Same as Alternative 1.	Off-road vehicular travel for “necessary tasks” would not be allowed (OHV definition in the Glossary). Exceptions may be authorized on a case-by-case basis following environmental analysis.	Same as Alternative 1.
OHV use in the Sand Hills ACEC would be limited to designated roads and vehicle routes and open to over-the-snow vehicles.	Same as Alternative 1.	OHV use in the Sand Hills/JO Ranch ACEC (12,700 acres) would be limited to designated roads and vehicle routes and closed to over-the-snow vehicles.	Same as Alternative 1.
The unique vegetation complex of the Sand Hills ACEC would be protected from sources of disturbance through intensive management of surface disturbing and disruptive activities. Case-by-case examination of any proposed surface disturbing and disruptive activity would be made to determine potential adverse effects and appropriate mitigation to minimize those effects.	Same as Alternative 1.	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be prohibited to protect the vegetation complex of the Sand Hills ACEC, subject to valid existing rights.	Same as Alternative 1.
New fence construction would be authorized to BLM standards. Existing fences would be modified to current BLM standards as needed.	Same as Alternative 1.	To protect big game seasonal migration, no new fences would be authorized. Existing fences would be modified to current BLM standards.	Same as Alternative 1.
No similar action.	No similar action.	The 18 acres that include the JO Ranch buildings and a 2-mile transition zone or the visual horizon, whichever is closer, would be designated as VRM Class II.	Same as Alternative 3.

<b>SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREAS</b>				
<b>Alternative 1</b>	<b>Alternative 2</b>	<b>Alternative 3</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)</b>	
The ACEC is designated an AMR area with emphasis on fire suppression.	The Sand Hills area is designated an AMR area with emphasis on fire suppression.	The AMR for fire in the Sand Hills ACEC is to limit the growth potential of wildfires to the smallest possible size. Fuel reduction activities would reduce fire spread through the use of firebreaks along existing roads and vehicle routes.	Same as Alternative 3.	
No similar action	No similar action	Turn the historic ranch into an interpretive site exhibiting late 19 <sup>th</sup> century ranching in the area, and the roles of historic roads and vehicle routes throughout the area.	Develop an interpretive program for the JO Ranch.	
<b>Jep Canyon ACEC/Jep Canyon Wildlife Habitat Management Area</b>				
<b>Management Goals by Alternative</b>				
To maintain the integrity of crucial winter habitat for elk.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	
To maintain the productivity of nesting raptor pairs.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	
To seek the cooperation of owners of adjacent property in management of the habitat.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	
<b>Management Actions by Alternative</b>				
The Jep Canyon ACEC (Map 2-7, 13,810 acres) would be maintained.	The ACEC designation would not be maintained, and would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area.	Same as Alternative 2.	Same as Alternative 2.	
The area would be open to oil and gas leasing with intensive management of surface disturbing and disruptive activities.	Same as Alternative 1.	The area would be closed to new federal oil and gas leasing. Surface disturbing and disruptive activities on existing leases would be intensively managed to meet the objectives of the wildlife habitat management area.	The area would be open to oil and gas leasing. Surface disturbing activities on oil and gas leases would be intensively managed to meet the objectives of the wildlife habitat management area.	
Plans of operations would be required for locatable mineral exploration and development (except casual use), for surface disturbance of 5 acres or more.	Plans of operations would be required for locatable mineral exploration and development (except casual use), for surface disturbance of 5 acres or more.	Public lands would be closed to locatable mineral entry and operation of the public land laws, including sale. Withdrawals would be pursued.	Same as Alternative 2.	

<b>SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREAS</b>			
<b>Alternative 1</b>	<b>Alternative 2</b>	<b>Alternative 3</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)</b>
Those areas open to locatable mineral entry would also be open to mineral material disposals.	Same as Alternative 1.	Those areas closed to locatable mineral entry would also be closed to mineral material disposals.	Same as Alternative 1.
No similar action.	No similar action.	As opportunities arise, acquisition of adjacent lands or easements to improve public access would be considered and evaluated.	Same as Alternative 3.
Off-road vehicular travel for "necessary tasks" would be allowed (OHV definition in the Glossary).	Same as Alternative 1.	Off-road vehicular travel for "necessary tasks" would not be allowed. Exceptions may be authorized on a case-by-case basis following environmental analysis.	Same as Alternative 1.
In the Jep Canyon ACEC, OHV use would be limited to designated roads and vehicle routes and open to over-the-snow vehicles.	No similar action.	OHV use would be limited to designated roads and vehicle routes and closed to over-the-snow vehicles.	Same as Alternative 3.
Surface disturbance in the aspen communities would be intensively managed. Case-by-case examination of any proposed surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be made to determine potential adverse effects and appropriate mitigation to minimize and/or reduce these effects.	No similar action.	Surface disturbance in the aspen communities would be restricted or prohibited through intensive management. Case-by-case examination of any proposed surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be made to determine potential adverse effects and appropriate mitigation to minimize and/or reduce these effects.	Surface disturbance in the aspen communities would be intensively managed. Case-by-case examination of any proposed surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be made to determine potential adverse effects and appropriate mitigation to minimize and/or reduce these effects.
The ACEC is designated an AMR fire suppression area.	The area is designated an AMR fire suppression area.	Same as Alternative 2.	Public lands within the checkerboard or other intermixed landownership areas would be managed in association with the private and state lands therein. AMR would most often result in suppression activities (Map 2-9).

SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREAS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)
<b>Shamrock Hills ACEC</b>			
<b>Management Goals by Alternative</b>			
To protect the concentration of breeding and nesting ferruginous hawk species, as well as other bird species, including the mountain plover, sage sparrow, and Greater sage-grouse.	Same as Alternative 1.	To maintain or improve habitat and protect the concentration of breeding and nesting ferruginous hawk species, as well as other bird species, including the mountain plover, sage sparrow, and Greater sage-grouse.	Same as Alternative 1.
To seek the cooperation of owners of adjacent property in management of the habitat.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
<b>Management Actions by Alternative</b>			
The Shamrock Hills ACEC (Map 2-7, 18,400 acres) would be maintained.	The ACEC designation would not be maintained, and would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area.	The ACEC designation would not be maintained, and the area would be managed as a raptor concentration area.	Same as Alternative 3.
Plans of operations would be required for locatable mineral exploration and development (except casual use), for surface disturbance of five acres or more.	Plans of operations would be required for locatable mineral exploration and development (except casual use), for surface disturbance of five acres or more.	Public lands would be closed to locatable mineral entry and operation of the public land laws, including sale. Withdrawals would be pursued.	Same as Alternative 2.
Those areas open to locatable mineral entry would also be open to mineral material disposals.	Same as Alternative 1.	Those areas closed to locatable mineral entry would also be closed to mineral material disposals.	The area would be open to mineral material disposals.
Off-road vehicular travel for “necessary tasks” would be allowed (OHV definition in the Glossary).	Same as Alternative 1.	Off-road vehicular travel for “necessary tasks” would not be allowed. Exceptions may be authorized on a case-by-case basis following environmental analysis.	Same as Alternative 1.
The area is designated an AMR fire suppression area.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands within the checkerboard or other intermixed landownership areas would be managed in association with the private and state lands therein. AMR would most often result in suppression activities (Map 2-9).

		<b>SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREAS</b>		
	<b>Alternative 1</b>	<b>Alternative 2</b>	<b>Alternative 3</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)</b>
<b>Stratton Sagebrush Steppe Research Area Potential ACEC</b>				
<b>Management Goals by Alternative</b>				
To protect the integrity of the historic and scientific values in the study area.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
<b>Management Actions by Alternative</b>				
The Stratton Sagebrush Steppe Research Area Potential ACEC (Map 2-7, 5,530 acres) would continue to be managed to meet demands for research.	The proposed area would be managed as a research area and would not be designated as an ACEC.	The proposed area would be designated an ACEC.	The proposed area would be closed to oil and gas leasing. Operators would be required to submit a management plan to describe how activities would affect research objectives. Mitigation would be required, where necessary, to protect the research area.	Same as Alternative 2.
The area would be open to oil and gas leasing with a NSO stipulation. Surface disturbing activities on existing leases would be intensively managed.	The area would be open to oil and gas leasing. Operators would be required to submit a management plan to describe how activities would affect research objectives. Mitigation would be required, where necessary, to protect the research area.	The area would be closed to oil and gas leasing. Surface disturbing activities on existing leases would be intensively managed to meet the objectives of the ACEC.	The area would be closed to oil and gas leasing. Surface disturbing activities on existing leases would be intensively managed to meet the objectives of the research area.	Same as Alternative 2.
Livestock grazing would be managed to meet multiple-use objectives.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Livestock grazing would be managed to meet research objectives of the ACEC.	Livestock grazing would be managed to meet objectives of the research area.
The area is designated an AMR fire suppression area.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	The area is designated an AMR fire suppression area to meet the research objectives of the ACEC.	The area is designated an AMR fire suppression area to meet the research objectives of the research area.
Off-road vehicular travel for “necessary tasks” would be allowed (OHV definition in the Glossary).	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Off-road vehicular travel for “necessary tasks” would not be allowed. Exceptions may be authorized on a case-by-case basis following environmental analysis.	Same as Alternative 3.
<b>Chain Lakes Potential ACEC</b>				
<b>Management Goals by Alternative</b>				
To protect the unique, fragile, and rare alkaline desert lake system, which requires additional protection through more intensive management and to maintain wildlife habitat values.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.

<b>SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREAS</b>			
<b>Management Actions by Alternative</b>	<b>Alternative 1</b>	<b>Alternative 2</b>	<b>Alternative 3</b>
			<b>Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)</b>
The Chain Lakes area (Map 2-7, 30,470 acres) would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area.	The Chain Lakes area would not be designated as an ACEC, and would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area.	The Chain Lakes area (Map 2-8, 30,470 acres) would be managed as an ACEC.	Same as Alternative 1.
Public lands would be open to locatable mineral entry and open to operation of public land laws, including sale.	Same Alternative as 1.	Public lands would be closed to locatable mineral entry and operation of the public land laws, including sale. Withdrawals would be pursued.	Same as Alternative 1.
Public lands would be open to mineral materials disposals.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands within the ACEC would be closed to mineral material disposals.	Same as Alternative 1.
The area would be open to oil and gas leasing with intensive management of surface disturbing and disruptive activities.	Same as Alternative 1.	The area would be closed to oil and gas leasing. Surface disturbing activities on existing leases would be intensively managed to meet the objectives of the ACEC.	Same as Alternative 1.
The area is designated an AMR fire suppression area.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	AMR for wildland fire on public lands within the checkerboard or other intermixed landownership areas would be managed in association with the private and state lands therein.
Off-road vehicular travel for "necessary tasks" would be allowed.	Same as Alternative 1.	Off-road vehicular travel for "necessary tasks" would not be allowed. Exceptions may be authorized on a case-by-case basis following environmental analysis.	Same as Alternative 1.
Livestock would be managed to meet multiple-use objectives.	Same as Alternative 1.	This area would be managed as a vacant allotment (livestock grazing section).	Same as Alternative 3.
No similar action.	No similar action.	Surface disturbing activities within the unique alkaline desert wetland communities would be intensively managed.	Same as Alternative 3.

<b>SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREAS</b>			
<b>Alternative 1</b>	<b>Alternative 2</b>	<b>Alternative 3</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)</b>
<b>Laramie Peak Potential ACEC</b>			
<b>Management Goals by Alternative</b>			
To restore, improve and enhance habitat conditions for bighorn sheep and other wildlife species, including crucial winter range habitats for bighorn sheep, elk, and mule deer.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
<b>Management Actions by Alternative</b>			
The Laramie Peak area (Map 2-7) (18,940 acres) would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area.	The area would not be designated as an ACEC, and would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area.	The Laramie Peak area (Map 2-8)(18,940 acres) would be managed as an ACEC.	Same as Alternative 1.
Public lands would be open to locatable mineral entry.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands would be closed to locatable mineral entry. Withdrawals from locatable mineral entry would be pursued.	Same as Alternative 1.
Public lands within the area would be open to mineral material disposals.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands within the ACEC would be closed to mineral material disposals.	Same as Alternative 1.
Where opportunities arise, land tenure adjustments, including acquisition of lands, easements, or exchange, would be considered to meet the multiple-use objectives.	No similar action.	As opportunities arise, acquisition of adjacent lands or easements to improve public access would be considered and evaluated to meet the objective of the ACEC.	Actively pursue land tenure adjustments, including acquisition of lands, easements, or exchange, to meet the management objective of the wildlife habitat management area.
The area is designated an AMR fire suppression area.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	AMR on the public lands within the intermixed landownership areas would be managed in association with the private and state lands therein.
Off-road vehicular travel for "necessary tasks" would be allowed (OHV definition in the Glossary).	Same as Alternative 1.	Off-road vehicular travel for "necessary tasks" would not be allowed. Exceptions may be authorized on a case-by-case basis following environmental analysis.	Same as Alternative 3.
OHV use would be limited to designated roads and vehicle routes.	OHV use would be limited to existing roads and vehicle routes.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.

<b>SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREAS</b>			
<b>Alternative 1</b>	<b>Alternative 2</b>	<b>Alternative 3</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)</b>
<b>Red Rim-Daley Potential ACEC</b>			
Management Goals by Alternative			
To protect crucial winter habitat for pronghorn.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
<b>Management Actions for the Red Rim-Daley Potential ACEC by Alternative</b>			
The Red Rim-Daley area (Map 2-7, 15,980 acres) would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area.	Same as Alternative 1.	The Red Rim-Daley area (Map 2-8, 15,980 acres) would be managed as an ACEC.	Same as Alternative 1.
Public lands would be open to locatable mineral entry	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands would be closed to locatable mineral entry. Withdrawals from locatable mineral entry would be pursued.	Same as Alternative 1.
Plans of operations would be required for locatable mineral exploration and development (except casual use), for disturbance of five acres or more.	Same as Alternative 1.	No similar action.	Same as Alternative 1.
Public lands would be open to the operation of public land laws.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands would be closed to land tenure adjustments, including sale. Withdrawals would be pursued.	Same as Alternative 1.
No similar action.	No similar action.	Those areas closed to locatable mineral entry would also be closed to mineral material disposals.	No similar action.
No similar action.	No similar action.	As opportunities arise, acquisition of adjacent lands or easements to improve public access would be considered and evaluated.	No similar action.
Off-road vehicular travel for "necessary tasks" would be allowed (OHV definition in the Glossary).	Same as Alternative 1.	Off-road vehicular travel for "necessary tasks" would not be allowed. Exceptions may be authorized on a case-by-case basis following environmental analysis.	Same as Alternative 1.
The area is designated an AMR fire suppression area.	Same as Alternative 1.	The ACEC is designated an AMR fire suppression area.	AMR for fire on public lands within the Checkerboard or other intermixed landownership areas would be managed in association with the private and state lands therein.

		<b>SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREAS</b>		
<b>Alternative 1</b>	<b>Alternative 2</b>	<b>Alternative 3</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)</b>	
<b>Pennock Mountain Wildlife Habitat Management Area</b>				
<b>Management Goals by Alternative</b>				
To protect the crucial winter habitat for elk and mule deer.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
<b>Management Actions by Alternative</b>				
The Pennock Mountain wildlife habitat management area (7,770 acres) (Map 2-10) would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area and for all other compatible use.	The area would not be designated as an ACEC or a wildlife habitat management area.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
Actively pursue land tenure adjustments including acquisition of lands, easements, or exchange, to meet multiple-use management objectives.	No similar action.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
Public lands would be open to locatable mineral entry.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands would be closed to locatable mineral entry. Withdrawals from locatable mineral entry would be pursued.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
Public lands would be open to mineral material disposals.	Same as Alternative 1.	Those areas closed to locatable mineral entry would also be closed to mineral material disposals.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
Off-road vehicular travel for "necessary tasks" would be allowed.	Same as Alternative 1.	Off-road vehicular travel for "necessary tasks" would not be allowed. Exceptions may be authorized on a case-by-case basis following environmental analysis.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
The Pennock Mountain Wildlife Habitat Management Area would be closed to livestock grazing.	The area would be closed to grazing.	This area would be managed as a vacant allotment (livestock grazing section). Livestock grazing would be used as a management tool for the Pennock Mountain cooperative management unit.	Same as Alternative 3.	Same as Alternative 3.

<b>SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREAS</b>			
<b>Alternative 1</b>	<b>Alternative 2</b>	<b>Alternative 3</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)</b>
<b>Wick-Beumee Wildlife Habitat Management Area</b>			
<b>Management Goals by Alternative</b>			
To protect the winter range for elk, quality year-round habitat for wildlife, and public access for quality wildlife experiences.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
<b>Management Actions by Alternative</b>			
Public lands would be open to operation of the public land laws, including sale.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands would be closed to operation of the public land laws, including sale. Withdrawals would be pursued.	Public lands would be closed to land tenure adjustments, including sale. Withdrawals would be pursued.
Public lands would be open to locatable mineral entry.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands would be closed to locatable mineral entry. Withdrawals from locatable mineral entry would be pursued.	Same as Alternative 1.
Public lands would be open to mineral material disposals.	Same as Alternative 1.	Those areas closed to operation of the public land laws would also be closed to mineral material disposals.	Same as Alternative 1.
The area would be open to oil and gas leasing with intensive management of surface disturbing and disruptive activities.	Same as Alternative 1.	The area would be closed to oil and gas leasing. Surface disturbing and disruptive activities on existing leases would be intensively managed to meet the objectives of the wildlife habitat area.	Same as Alternative 1.
Off-road vehicular travel for "necessary tasks" would be allowed (OHV definition in the Glossary).	Same as Alternative 1.	Off-road vehicular travel for "necessary tasks" would not be allowed. Exceptions may be authorized on a case-by-case basis following environmental analysis.	Same as Alternative 1.
Surface disturbing activities in aspen communities would be intensively managed.	Same as Alternative 1.	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities in aspen communities would be avoided or prohibited.	Same as Alternative 1.

	<b>SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREAS</b>		
	<b>Alternative 1</b>	<b>Alternative 2</b>	<b>Alternative 3</b>
	<b>Shirley Mountain Caves SRMA/Shirley Mountain Bat Cave Potential ACEC</b>		
<b>Management Goals by Alternative</b>	To protect the hibernaculum for several bat species located within Cave Creek Cave as well as recreational caving opportunities.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
<b>Management Actions by Alternative</b>	The Shirley Mountain Caves SRMA (24,440 acres) (Map 2-14) would be managed to provide for protection and enjoyment of the cave system while other resource uses would be allowed aboveground.	The Shirley Mountain Caves SRMA would not be maintained.	The Shirley Mountain Caves SRMA would not be maintained. The Shirley Mountain Bat Cave area (520 acres) (Map 2-8) would be managed as an ACEC.
	Timber harvesting would be allowed to meet Healthy Forest Initiative objectives (see the Forest Management section of this table).	Timber harvesting would be intensively managed within $\frac{1}{4}$ mile of the cave complex to meet bat cave management and Healthy Forest Initiative objectives.	Timber harvesting would not be allowed within $\frac{1}{2}$ mile of the bat cave complex (Cave Creek).
	Public lands would be open to operation of the public land laws, including sale.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands would be closed to operation of the public land laws, including sale. Withdrawals would be pursued.
	Public lands would be open to locatable mineral entry (240 acres). Withdrawals from locatable mineral entry would be pursued.	Public lands would be closed to locatable mineral entry (240 acres). Withdrawals from locatable mineral entry would be pursued.	Public lands would be closed to locatable mineral entry (520 acres). Withdrawals from locatable mineral entry would be pursued.
	Public lands would be open to mineral material disposals.	Those areas closed to locatable mineral entry (240 acres) would also be closed to mineral material disposals.	Those areas closed to locatable mineral entry (520 acres) would also be closed to mineral material disposals.
	The area would be open to oil and gas leasing with intensive management of surface disturbing and disruptive activities.	Same as Alternative 1.	The area would be closed to oil and gas leasing. Surface disturbing activities on existing leases would be intensively managed to meet the objectives of the ACEC.

<b>SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREAS</b>				
<b>Alternative 1</b>	<b>Alternative 2</b>	<b>Alternative 3</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)</b>	
Seasonal closure of the Cave Creek cave gate to human occupancy from November 1 through March 31 for the protection of the bat hibernaculum.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Seasonal closure of the Cave Creek cave gate to human occupancy from October 15 through April 30 for the protection of the bat hibernaculum.	
Off-road vehicular travel for “necessary tasks” would be allowed (OHV definition in the Glossary).	Same as Alternative 1.	Off-road vehicular travel for “necessary tasks” would not be allowed. Exceptions may be authorized on a case-by-case basis following environmental analysis.	Same as Alternative 1.	
The area is designated an AMR fire suppression area.	The area is designated an AMR fire suppression area. Heavy equipment use would be limited in this area.	Same as Alternative 2.	The ACEC is designated an AMR fire suppression area. Heavy equipment use would be limited in this area.	
<b>Laramie Plains Lakes Potential ACEC Management Goals by Alternative</b>				
To protect potential habitat for the endangered Wyoming toad.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
<b>Management Actions by Alternative</b>				
The Laramie Plains Lakes area (1,600 acres) would not be designated as an ACEC, and would be managed as wildlife habitat management area.	Same as Alternative 1.	The Laramie Plains Lakes (Map 2-8, 1,600 acres) would be managed as an ACEC.	The Laramie Plains Lakes area (Map 2-13, 1,600 acres) would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area.	
Public lands would be open to operation of the public land laws, including sale.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands would be closed to operation of the public land laws, including sale. Withdrawals would be pursued.	Public lands would be closed to tenure adjustments, including sale. Withdrawals would be pursued.	
Actively pursue acquisition of lands or easements to enhance access to public lands and/or expand habitat to meet the objectives of the management area.	Acquisition of lands or easements to enhance access to public lands and/or expand habitat would not be pursued.	Actively pursue acquisition of lands or easements to enhance access to public lands and/or expand habitat to meet the objectives of the ACEC.	Actively pursue acquisition of lands or easements to enhance access to public lands and/or expand habitat to meet the objectives of the ACEC.	Same as Alternative 1.
Public lands would be open to locatable mineral entry.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands would be closed to locatable mineral entry. Withdrawals from locatable mineral entry would be pursued.	Public lands would be closed to locatable mineral entry. Withdrawals from locatable mineral entry would be pursued.	Same as Alternative 1.

<b>SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREAS</b>			
<b>Alternative 1</b>	<b>Alternative 2</b>	<b>Alternative 3</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)</b>
Public lands would be open to mineral material disposals.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands would be closed to mineral material disposals.	Public lands would be open to mineral material disposals with avoidance of potential habitat for the endangered Wyoming toad.
The area would be open to oil and gas leasing with intensive management of surface disturbing and disruptive activities.	Same as Alternative 1.	The area would be closed to oil and gas leasing. Surface disturbing activities on existing leases would be intensively managed to meet the objectives of the wildlife habitat area.	Same as Alternative 1.
The area is designated an AMR fire suppression area.	Same as Alternative 1.	The ACEC is designated an AMR fire suppression area.	Same as Alternative 1.
Off-road vehicular travel for "necessary tasks" would be allowed (OHV definition in the Glossary).	Same as Alternative 1.	Off-road vehicular travel for "necessary tasks" would not be allowed. Exceptions may be authorized on a case-by-case basis following environmental analysis.	Same as Alternative 3.
Livestock grazing use would be managed to meet multiple-use objectives.	Same as Alternative 1.	Livestock grazing use would be managed to meet the objectives of the ACEC.	Same as Alternative 1.
<b>Historic Trails (Cherokee, Overland, Rawlins to Baggs, and Rawlins to Fort Washakie) Potential ACEC</b>			
<b>Management Goals by Alternative</b>	<b>Potential ACEC</b>		
To stabilize and protect significant sites and segments along the trails.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
<b>Management Actions by Alternative</b>	<b>Potential ACEC</b>		
The Cherokee and Overland trails area (contributing segments within 41,000 acres of federal land) would be managed for the preservation of historic values.	Same as Alternative 1.	The area within 1/4 mile from the edge of the Overland Trail, Cherokee Trail, Rawlins to Baggs Road, and Rawlins to Fort Washakie Road would be designated an ACEC (Map 2-8).	Same as Alternative 1.
An area within 1/4 mile or the visual horizon of the trail, whichever is closer, would be an avoidance area for surface disturbing and disruptive activities (Map 2-46).	Same as Alternative 1.	Surface disturbing activities would not be allowed within the ACEC (Map 2-47).	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would not be allowed within 1/4 mile or the visual horizon, whichever is closer, of the historic trails (Map 2-48).

<b>SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREAS</b>			
<b>Alternative 1</b>	<b>Alternative 2</b>	<b>Alternative 3</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)</b>
An area within ¼ mile or the visual horizon of the trails, whichever is closer, would be open to oil and gas leasing and would be an avoidance area for surface disturbing and disruptive activities.	Same as Alternative 1.	The ACEC would be open to oil and gas leasing with an NSO stipulation. Surface disturbing activities on existing leases would be intensively managed.	An area within ¼ mile or the visual horizon of the trails, whichever is closer, would be open to oil and gas leasing with an NSO stipulation. Surface disturbing and disruptive activities on existing leases would be intensively managed.
Public lands within the historic trails area would be open to locatable mineral entry.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands within the ACEC would be closed to locatable mineral entry and operation of the public land laws, including sale. Withdrawals would be pursued.	<p>Public lands within ¼ mile or the visual horizon of the trails, whichever is closer, would be closed to locatable mineral entry and operation of the public land laws (only) within contributing portions of the trails.</p> <p>Public lands within ¼ mile or the visual horizon of the trails, whichever is closer, would be open to locatable mineral entry and operation of the public land laws within noncontributing portions of the trails.</p> <p>Unevaluated portions of the trails would be managed as contributing until cultural resource inventories are conducted and an evaluation is made as to their contributing/non-contributing status (Appendix 5).</p>

<b>SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREAS</b>			
<b>Alternative 1</b>	<b>Alternative 2</b>	<b>Alternative 3</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)</b>
Public lands within the historic trails area would be open to mineral material disposals.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands within the ACEC would be closed to mineral material disposals.	Public lands within $\frac{1}{4}$ mile or the visual horizon, whichever is closer, would be closed to mineral material disposals within contributing portions of the trails.
			Public lands within $\frac{1}{4}$ mile of the visual horizon of the trails, whichever is closer, would be open to mineral material disposals within the noncontributing portions of the trails. Unevaluated portions of the trails would be managed as contributing until cultural resource inventories are conducted and an evaluation is made as to their contributing/non-contributing status (Appendix 5)."
No similar action.	No similar action.	The setting that contributes to NRHP eligibility within 5 miles of historic trails would be designated as VRM Class II (Map 2-49). Those areas where the setting does not contribute to NRHP eligibility would be designated the same as the surrounding VRM class.	The setting that contributes to NRHP eligibility within 2 miles of historic trails would be designated as VRM Class II (Map 2-50). Those areas where the setting does not contribute to NRHP eligibility would be designated the same as the surrounding VRM class.
<b>Blowout Penstemon ACEC Management Goals by Alternative</b>		Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
To protect the unique parabolic dune complex of steep sandy slopes deposited at the base of granite or sedimentary mountains or ridges that contains the only known population of the endangered blowout penstemon plant in Wyoming, and protect the area to assure the continued existence of the plant and to allow for the continued research of this unique plant.			

<b>SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREAS</b>				
<b>Alternative 1</b>	<b>Alternative 2</b>	<b>Alternative 3</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)</b>	
<b>Management Actions for the Blowout Penstemon ACEC by Alternative</b>				
The Blowout Penstemon area (4,020 acres) would not be designated as an ACEC.	Same as Alternative 1.	The proposed area would be designated as an ACEC and managed as an endangered plant habitat area (Map 2-8).	Same as Alternative 3.	Same as Alternative 3.
The area would be open to locatable mineral entry and mineral material disposals.	Same as Alternative 1.	The ACEC would be closed to locatable mineral entry and mineral material disposals. Withdrawal would be pursued.	Same as Alternative 3.	Same as Alternative 3.
The area is designated an AMR fire suppression area.	Same as Alternative 1.	Fire suppression activities would be utilized to maintain early succession plant communities.	Same as Alternative 3.	Same as Alternative 3.
Actively pursue land tenure adjustments, including acquisition of lands, easements, or exchange, to meet the resource management objectives.	No similar action.	Actively pursue land tenure adjustments, including acquisition of lands, easements, or exchange, to meet the ACEC management goals.	Same as Alternative 3.	Same as Alternative 3.
Off-road vehicular travel for "necessary tasks" would be allowed (see definitions of OHV and necessary tasks in the Glossary).	Same as Alternative 1.	Off-road vehicular travel for "necessary tasks" would not be allowed (see definition of necessary tasks in the Glossary). Exceptions may be authorized on a case-by-case basis following environmental analysis.	Same as Alternative 3.	Same as Alternative 3.
<b>Upper Muddy Creek Watershed/Grizzly Potential ACEC</b>				
<b>Management Goals by Alternative</b>				
To protect the Colorado River fish fauna that is unique to the Muddy Creek watershed and to protect general riparian function.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
To protect the crucial winter habitat for elk.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
<b>Management Actions by Alternative</b>				
The Grizzly Allotment portion of the Upper Muddy Creek Watershed/Grizzly area (26,850 acres) would be managed as WHMA (Map 2-10).	The Upper Muddy Creek Watershed/Grizzly area (70,780 acres) would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area (Map 2-11).	The proposed area (70,780 acres) would be designated as an ACEC (Map 2-8).	The area would not be designated as an ACEC and would be managed as a fish habitat management area (70,780 acres)(Map 2-13).	The area would not be designated as an ACEC and would be managed as a fish habitat management area (70,780 acres)(Map 2-13).

<b>SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREAS</b>			
<b>Alternative 1</b>	<b>Alternative 2</b>	<b>Alternative 3</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)</b>
The area would be open to oil and gas leasing with intensive management of surface disturbing and disruptive activities.	Same as Alternative 1.	NSO stipulations would be applied on existing leases within ¼ mile of all ephemeral or perennial stream channels. Surface disturbing activities on existing leases with ¼ mile of all ephemeral and perennial stream channels would be intensively managed. Surface disturbing activities on existing leases in the remainder of the proposed area would be intensively managed.	Same as Alternative 1.
Public lands would be open to locatable mineral entry.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands would be closed to locatable mineral entry. Withdrawals from locatable mineral entry would be pursued.	Same as Alternative 1.
Plans of operation would be required for locatable mineral exploration and development (except casual use), for disturbances of five acres or more.	Same as Alternative 1.	No similar action.	Same as Alternative 1.
Those areas open to locatable mineral entry would also be open to mineral material disposals.	Same as Alternative 1.	Those areas closed to locatable mineral entry would also be closed to mineral material disposals.	Those areas open to locatable mineral entry would also be open to mineral material disposals with consideration given to fish habitat.
Public lands would be open to the operation of the public land laws.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands would be closed to land tenure adjustments, including sale. Withdrawals would be pursued.	Same as Alternative 1.
Motorized vehicle use would be limited to designated roads and vehicle routes.	Same as Alternative 1.	Motorized vehicle use would be limited to designated roads and vehicle routes. Closures of specific roads and vehicle routes, including seasonal closures, would be considered on a case-by-case basis to meet the objectives of the ACEC.	Motorized vehicle use would be limited to designated roads and vehicle routes. Closures of specific roads and vehicle routes, including seasonal closures, would be considered on a case-by-case basis to meet the objectives of the fish habitat management area.

<b>SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREAS</b>			
<b>Alternative 1</b>	<b>Alternative 2</b>	<b>Alternative 3</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)</b>
Off-road vehicular travel for “necessary tasks” would be allowed (OHV definition in the Glossary).	Same as Alternative 1.	Off-road vehicular travel for “necessary tasks” would not be allowed. Exceptions may be authorized on a case-by-case basis following environmental analysis.	Same as Alternative 1.
Surface-disturbance activities would be prohibited within 500 feet of Muddy and Littlefield Creek riparian systems. Where surface disturbance cannot be avoided intensive management would be applied to any surface disturbing activity.	Same as Alternative 1.	No surface disturbing or disruptive activities would be allowed within 500 feet of Muddy and Littlefield Creek riparian systems.	Same as Alternative 1.
Areas within 500 feet of ephemeral and perennial streams would be avoidance areas for developments, uses, and facilities. Where disturbance from linear features could not be avoided, intensive management would be applied.	Same as Alternative 1.	Areas within $\frac{1}{4}$ mile of ephemeral and perennial streams would be avoidance areas for developments, uses, and facilities. Where disturbance from linear features could not be avoided, intensive management would be applied.	Avoidance areas for surface disturbing and disruptive activities and linear crossings would include (1) identified 100-year flood plains, (2) areas within 500 feet from perennial waters, springs, wells, and wetland/riparian areas, and (3) areas 100 feet from the inner gorge of ephemeral channels.
In-stream structures that interfere with the movement of native fishes among habitats would be removed, reconstructed, or retrofitted to allow fish passage. Barriers built to facilitate reintroduction efforts would be maintained until they have completed their purpose.	No similar action.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
Implement management actions to reintroduce the Colorado River cutthroat trout (CRCT) and other native fishes within those portions of the Muddy Creek watershed above the confluence with McKinney Creek.	Same as Alternative 1.	Actively pursue, in cooperation with WGFD, USFS, and private landowners, opportunities to expand reintroduction efforts for CRCT and other native cold and warm water fishes into adjacent habitats within the upper Muddy Creek watershed.	Same as Alternative 3.

<b>SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREAS</b>				
<b>Alternative 1</b>	<b>Alternative 2</b>	<b>Alternative 3</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)</b>	
Surface disturbing activities in aspen communities would be intensively managed.	No similar action.	Surface disturbing activities in aspen communities would be restricted or prohibited through intensive management of surface disturbing and disruptive activities.	Surface disturbing activities in aspen communities would be intensively managed. Aspen stands would be managed to increase distribution and improve serial structure.	
The area is designated an AMR fire suppression area.	Same as Alternative 1.	The ACEC is designated an AMR fire suppression area.	Same as Alternative 1.	
<b>White-Tailed Prairie Dog Potential ACEC Management Goals by Alternative</b>	<b>Management Actions by Alternative</b>	<b>Management Actions by Alternative</b>	<b>Management Actions by Alternative</b>	
The areas would be managed for the protection of prairie dog habitat, a keystone species.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	
The white-tailed prairie dog areas would not be designated as an ACEC.	Same as Alternative 1.	The white-tailed prairie dog areas (Map 2-8) would be managed as an ACEC for protection of prairie dog habitat. (Note: eight identified complexes have not been mapped and the acreage has not been determined.)	Same as Alternative 1.	
Surface disturbing or disruptive activities within white-tailed prairie dog towns would be avoided.	No similar action.	Surface disturbing or disruptive activities within White-tailed Prairie Dog ACEC would be prohibited within 164 feet (50 meters).	Same as Alternative 1.	
Public lands would be open to locatable mineral entry.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands would be closed to locatable mineral entry. Withdrawal from locatable mineral entry would be pursued.	Same as Alternative 1.	
Public lands would be open to mineral material disposals.	Same as Alternative 1.	Those areas closed to locatable mineral entry would be closed to mineral material disposals.	Same as Alternative 1.	
Above ground facilities (with the exception of power lines) within $\frac{1}{4}$ mile of white-tailed prairie dog towns would not be equipped with anti-raptor perching devices.	Same as Alternative 1.	No above ground facilities would be allowed within $\frac{1}{4}$ mile of white-tailed prairie dog towns, unless the facilities are equipped with anti-raptor perching devices.	Same as Alternative 1.	

<b>SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREAS</b>			
<b>Alternative 1</b>	<b>Alternative 2</b>	<b>Alternative 3</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)</b>
Land tenure adjustments to benefit white-tailed prairie dogs would not be pursued.	Same as Alternative 1.	As opportunity arises, land tenure adjustments, including acquisition of lands, easements, or exchange, would be pursued to meet the ACEC objectives.	Same as Alternative 1.
Motorized vehicle use would be limited to designated roads and vehicle routes.	Same as Alternative 1.	Motorized vehicle use would be limited to designated roads and vehicle routes. Closures of specific roads and vehicle routes would be considered on a case-by-case basis to meet the objectives of the ACEC. New road construction would be assessed on a case-by-case basis.	Motorized vehicle use would be limited to either designated roads and vehicle routes or existing roads and vehicle routes depending on the land ownership pattern in the area of specific white-tailed prairie dog complexes.
Prairie dog poisoning would be allowed in white-tailed prairie dog towns/complexes in accordance to existing, local Annual Predator Damage Management Plans.	Same as Alternative 1.	Prairie dog poisoning by Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) would not be allowed in white-tailed prairie dog towns and complexes, except for demonstrated reasons of human health and safety.	Same as Alternative 3.
<b>High Savery Dam Potential ACEC Management Goals by Alternative</b>			
To protect the High Savery Dam and Reservoir Site.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
To develop part of the site as a fishery for CRCT.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
To manage the area for recreation purposes.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
<b>Management Actions by Alternative</b>			
The High Savery Dam and Reservoir area (530 acres) would be managed jointly with WWDC according to the memorandum of understanding (MOU) dated June 2, 2003, as presented in Appendix 23.	Same as Alternative 1.	The High Savery Dam would be managed as an ACEC (Map 2-8).	Same as Alternative 1.
Public lands would be open to locatable mineral entry.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands would be closed to locatable mineral entry. Withdrawals would be pursued.	Same as Alternative 3.

<b>SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREAS</b>				
<b>Alternative 1</b>	<b>Alternative 2</b>	<b>Alternative 3</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)</b>	
Public lands would be open to mineral material disposals.	Same as Alternative 1.	Those areas closed to locatable mineral entry would also be closed to mineral material disposals.	Same as Alternative 3.	
Public lands would be open to operation of public land laws, including sale, where consistent with the intent and purpose of the MOU.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands would be closed to land tenure adjustment, including sale. Withdrawals from lands disposal would be pursued.	Same as Alternative 1.	
<b>Special Recreation Management Areas</b>				
<b>Continental Divide National Scenic Trail SRMA</b>				
<b>Management Goals by Alternative</b>				
To promote the recreational use and scenic values of the Continental Divide National Scenic Trail.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	
To emphasize interpretive and educational opportunities.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	
<b>Management Actions by Alternative</b>				
Public lands (600 acres) would be open to locatable mineral entry.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands would be closed to locatable mineral entry. Withdrawals from locatable mineral entry would be pursued.	Same as Alternative 3.	
Public lands (600 acres) would be open to the operation of the public land laws.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands would be closed to land tenure adjustments, including sales. Withdrawals would be pursued.	Same as Alternative 3.	
<b>North Platte River Area</b>				
<b>Management Goals by Alternative</b>				
To enhance opportunities for public use and access for recreational activities and maintain the quality of the river experience.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	
<b>Management Actions by Alternative</b>				
The SRMA would be managed to provide high-quality recreational opportunities, especially for floating, fishing, camping, and sightseeing. Current public facilities and access would be maintained to support the values of the SRMA.	This area would not be managed as a SRMA.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	

<b>SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREAS</b>				
<b>Alternative 1</b>	<b>Alternative 2</b>	<b>Alternative 3</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)</b>	
The SRMA (5,060 acres, including the ¼-mile area on either side of the river) would be open to oil and gas leasing with intensive management of surface disturbance (Map 2-14).	Same as Alternative 1.	The SRMA (12,740 acres, including the ½-mile area on either side of the river) would be closed to oil and gas leasing (Map 2-16).	The SRMA (5,060 acres, including the ¼-mile area on either side of the river) would be open to oil and gas leasing with intensive management of surface disturbance (Map 2-17).	The SRMA (5,060 acres, including the ¼-mile area on either side of the river) would be open to oil and gas leasing with intensive management of surface disturbance (Map 2-17).
The SRMA (5,060 acres, including the ¼-mile area on either side of the river) would be open to oil and gas leasing with intensive management of surface disturbance (Map 2-14).	The area would be open to locatable mineral entry and mineral material disposals, with surface disturbing and disruptive activities restricted to maintain the quality of the visual resource.	The SRMA (12,740 acres, including the ½-mile area on either side of the river) would be closed to locatable mineral entry and mineral material disposals, and operation of the public land laws, including sale. Withdrawals would be pursued.	The SRMA (5,060 acres, including the ¼-mile area on either side of the river) would be closed to locatable mineral entry and mineral material disposals, and operation of the public land laws, including sale. Withdrawals would be pursued.	The SRMA (5,060 acres, including the ¼-mile area on either side of the river) would be closed to locatable mineral entry and mineral material disposals, with surface disturbing and disruptive activities restricted to maintain the quality of the visual resource.
Surface disturbing activities on public lands within ¼ mile on either side of the river would be intensively managed to maintain the quality of the visual resource.	Surface disturbing activities on public lands within ½ mile on either side of the river would be managed using standard mitigation measures (Appendix 1).	Surface disturbing activities on public lands within ½ mile on either side of the river would be intensively managed to maintain the quality of the visual resource.	Surface disturbing activities on public lands within ½ mile on either side of the river would be intensively managed to maintain the quality of the visual resource.	Same as Alternative 1.
<b>Rawlins OHV Area Management Goals by Alternative</b>		Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
To provide BLM with a forum for educating the OHV community on riding ethics and regulations, and to provide a safe riding opportunity for skill development and recreation.				
<b>Management Actions by Alternative</b>		This area would be managed as a SRMA.	Same as Alternative 2.	Same as Alternative 1.
A 480-acre OHV area would be constructed at Hogback Lake. This area would provide for an OHV play area near the town of Rawlins.	A 480-acre OHV area would be constructed at Hogback Lake. This SRMA would provide for an OHV play area near the town of Rawlins (Map 2-15).	A 480-acre OHV area would be constructed at Hogback Lake. This SRMA would provide for competitive events, recreational OHV riding, and an instructional practice area for youth (Map 2-16).	Construct a 480-acre OHV area at Hogback Lake. This area would provide for competitive events, recreational OHV riding, and an instructional practice area.	OHV use in this area would be limited to designated roads and vehicle routes (Map 2-44).
OHV use in this area would be limited to designated roads and vehicle routes (Map 2-5).	OHV use in this SRMA would be open to OHV travel (Map 2-42).	OHV use in this SRMA would be limited to designated roads and vehicle routes (Map 2-43).	OHV use in this area would be limited to designated roads and vehicle routes (Map 2-44).	OHV use in this area would be limited to designated roads and vehicle routes (Map 2-44).

<b>SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREAS</b>			
<b>Alternative 1</b>	<b>Alternative 2</b>	<b>Alternative 3</b>	<b>Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)</b>
The area would be open to locatable mineral entry and operation of the public land laws, including sale.	The area would be closed to locatable mineral entry and operation of the public land laws, including sale.	Same as Alternative 2.	Same as Alternative 2.
Areas open to locatable mineral entry would also be open to mineral material disposals.	Areas closed to locatable mineral entry would also be closed to mineral material disposals.	Same as Alternative 2.	Same as Alternative 2.
The area would be open to oil and gas leasing.	The area would be closed to oil and gas leasing. Existing leases would be intensively managed.	Same as Alternative 2.	Same as Alternative 2.
<b>National Natural Landmarks Management</b>			
<b>Management Goals by Alternative</b>			
To maintain the integrity of existing and proposed NNLs.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
<b>Management Actions</b>			
Management actions for management of national natural landmarks are common to all alternatives and are presented in Section 2.3.			
<b>Wild and Scenic Rivers (Encampment River Potential Wild and Scenic River)</b>			
<b>Management Goals by Alternative</b>			
To maintain or enhance the outstandingly remarkable values for waterways in the RMPPA that meets the WSR suitability factors until Congress decides whether to include the suitable waterway in the NWRSRs.	No similar action.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
<b>Management Actions by Alternative</b>			
Surface disturbing activities would not be allowed within ½ mile of the Encampment River (Map 2-19).	No similar action.	Surface disturbing activities would not be allowed within the viewshed of the Encampment River.	Same as Alternative 3.
Geophysical exploration would be limited to foot access and the use of surface cables on the public lands. Surface charges may be allowed following site-specific analysis.	No similar action.	Geophysical exploration would be not be allowed.	Same as Alternative 1.
Vegetation treatments would be restricted to hand or aerial application.	No similar action.	Vegetation treatments would be restricted to hand application.	Same as Alternative 1.

TRANSPORTATION AND ACCESS MANAGEMENT				
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)	
<b>Management Goals by Alternative</b>				
To accommodate access needs for approved public land uses and to manage access where appropriate to protect resource values.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
<b>Management Actions by Alternative</b>				
Consistent with Wyoming BLM access policy, opportunities to acquire or maintain legal access to the following areas (in order of priority) would be pursued (see Areas of Priority Access for Easement Acquisition in Table 2-8 at the end of this chapter).	Consistent with Wyoming BLM access policy, opportunities to acquire or maintain legal access to public lands would be pursued as opportunities arise.	Consistent with Wyoming BLM access policy, opportunities to acquire or maintain legal access to the following areas (in order of priority) would be pursued (see Areas of Priority Access for Easement Acquisition in Table 2-8 at the end of this chapter).	Consistent with Wyoming BLM access policy, opportunities to acquire or maintain legal access to the following areas (in order of priority) would be pursued (see Areas of Priority Access for Easement Acquisition in Table 2-8 at the end of this chapter).	Same as Alternative 3.
To respond to public demand for land use authorizations or other multiple uses, new access would be pursued. Existing access would be maintained or expanded, and excess existing access facilities would be abandoned or closed on a case-by-case basis.	Same as Alternative 1.	To respond to public demand for land use authorizations or other multiple uses, new access would be pursued. Existing access would be maintained or expanded, and excess existing access facilities would be abandoned or closed after consultation with local government and interested parties.	Same as Alternative 1.	To respond to public demand for land use authorizations or other multiple uses, new access would be pursued. Existing access would be maintained or expanded, and excess existing access facilities would be abandoned or closed after consultation with local government and interested parties.
Consolidation of public lands would be pursued to increase recreational opportunities for the public land pursued (Table 2-8 at the end of this chapter).	Consolidation of public lands would be pursued, when opportunities arise, to meet recreational demand (Table 2-8 at the end of this chapter). The criteria for which lands would be acquired include in holdings within WSAs, some SMAs, and HMAs (Appendix 6).	Consolidation of public lands would be pursued, when opportunities arise, to meet recreational demand (Table 2-8 at the end of this chapter). The criteria for which lands would be acquired include in holdings within WSAs, some SMAs, and HMAs (Appendix 6).	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 2.
				<b>VEGETATION</b>
<b>Management Goals by Alternative</b>				
To restore, protect, or enhance the diversity and distribution of healthy, functioning ecosystems consisting of native vegetation communities.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.

		VEGETATION	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)
Alternative 1	To restore healthy, functioning native plant communities through reclamation of surface disturbing and disruptive activities.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
To enhance the health and diversity of plant communities through use of natural fire and management prescriptions, such as burning, plantings, seedings, and chemical, mechanical, biological, and grazing treatments.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
To manage public lands to protect, preserve or enhance T&E and plant species and unique plant communities on the BLM Wyoming State Director's Sensitive Species List.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
To control the introduction and proliferation of noxious weeds and invasive species and reduce established populations to acceptable levels. Priority would be to reduce and eliminate, where possible, small new infestations and to control large infestations.	To control the introduction and proliferation of noxious weeds, invasive species and poisonous plants, and reduce established populations to acceptable levels. Priority would be placed on areas where commodity benefits would be enhanced.	To control the introduction and proliferation of noxious weeds and invasive species and reduce established populations to acceptable levels. Priority would be maintenance and attainment of native, weed-free communities.	To control the introduction and proliferation of noxious weeds and invasive species and reduce established populations to acceptable levels. Priority would be maintenance and attainment of native, weed-free communities.	To control the introduction and proliferation of noxious weeds and invasive species and reduce established populations to acceptable levels. Priority would be maintenance and attainment of native, weed-free communities.	Same as Alternative 1.
Management Actions by Alternative	Rangeland Desired Plant Community (DPC)	Vegetation treatments would be applied to increase forage for livestock and to meet standards for rangeland health and watershed function.	Vegetation treatments (biological and prescribed fire) would be applied to meet standards for rangeland health and watershed function, and to achieve DPC with an emphasis on habitat improvement for wildlife including special status species.	Vegetation treatments (mechanical, biological, chemical, and prescribed fire) would be applied to meet standards for rangeland health and watershed function, and to achieve DPC while considering habitat for wildlife including special status species.	Same as Alternative 3.
Rangeland areas would be managed to meet rangeland standards (Appendix 8).	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Rangeland areas would be managed to achieve DPC (Appendix 8).	Rangeland areas would be managed to achieve DPC (Appendix 8).	Same as Alternative 3.

		VEGETATION		
		Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3 (Preferred Alternative)
<b>Special Status Plant Species and Habitat</b>				
Management practices identified on a case-by-case basis would be applied to surface disturbing and disruptive activities to maintain or enhance special status plant species and their habitat (Appendix 24).	Management practices identified on a case-by-case basis would not be applied to surface disturbing and disruptive activities to maintain or enhance special status plant species and their habitat.	Same as Alternative 1	Same as Alternative 1	Same as Alternative 1.
Known habitat for threatened and endangered and proposed and candidate species would be open to oil and gas leasing with intensive management of surface disturbing and disruptive activities.	Same as Alternative 1.	Known habitat for threatened and endangered and proposed and candidate species would be open to oil and gas leasing with a NSO stipulation.		Same as Alternative 3.
Surface disturbing activities would be intensively managed (see definition of Intensive Management in the Glossary), in areas that contain habitat for the blowout penstemon, to maintain or enhance habitat for the plant.	Same as Alternative 1	Surface disturbing activities would not be allowed in areas that contain habitat for the blowout penstemon.		Same as Alternative 1.
Identified habitat for the blowout penstemon plant would be open to locatable mineral entry and mineral material disposals.	Same as Alternative 1	Identified habitat for the blowout penstemon plant would be closed to locatable mineral entry and mineral material disposals. Withdraws would be pursued.		Same as Alternative 3.
BLM-administered public lands that contain identified habitat for the blowout penstemon plant would not be exchanged or sold, when possible.	Same as Alternative 1	BLM-administered public lands that contain identified habitat for the blowout penstemon plant would not be exchanged or sold.		Same as Alternative 3.
Off-road vehicle travel for "necessary tasks" in identified habitat for the blowout penstemon plant would be allowed.	Same as Alternative 1	Off-road vehicle travel for "necessary tasks" in identified habitat for the blowout penstemon plant would not be allowed in order to protect the plant. Exceptions may be authorized on a case-by-case basis following environmental assessment.		Same as Alternative 3.

		VEGETATION			
		Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)
BLM-administered public lands that contain identified habitat for the Colorado butterfly plant would not be exchanged or sold, when possible.	Same as Alternative 1	BLM-administered public lands that contain identified habitat for the Colorado butterfly plant would not be exchanged or sold.		Same as Alternative 3.	Same as Alternative 3.
Recreational site development would not be authorized in known Colorado butterfly plant habitat, when possible.	Same as Alternative 1		Recreational site development would not be authorized in known Colorado butterfly plant habitat.		Same as Alternative 3.
BLM-administered public lands that contain identified habitat for the Ute ladies'-tresses plant would not be exchanged or sold, when possible.	Same as Alternative 1	BLM-administered public lands that contain identified habitat for the Ute ladies'-tresses plant would not be exchanged or sold.		Same as Alternative 3.	Same as Alternative 3.
Recreational site development would not be authorized in known Ute ladies'-tresses plant habitat, when possible.	Same as Alternative 1	Recreational site development would not be authorized in known Ute ladies'-tresses plant habitat.		Same as Alternative 3.	Same as Alternative 3.

  

		VISUAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT			
		Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)
<b>Management Goals by Alternative</b>	To minimize adverse effects on visual resources while maintaining the effectiveness of land use allocations.	Same as Alternative 1.		Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
<b>Management Actions by Alternative</b>	VRM classes would be designated as shown in Map 2-51 (Table 2-9 at the end of this chapter and Appendix 25).	VRM classes would be designated as shown in Map 2-52 (Table 2-9 at the end of this chapter and Appendix 25).	VRM classes would be designated as shown in Map 2-49 (Table 2-9 at the end of this chapter and Appendix 25).	VRM classes would be designated as shown in Map 2-50 (Table 2-9 at the end of this chapter and Appendix 25).	VRM classes would be designated as shown in Map 2-49 (Table 2-9 at the end of this chapter and Appendix 25).

WATER QUALITY, WATERSHED AND SOILS MANAGEMENT			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)
<b>Management Goals by Alternative</b>			
To manage surface land use and groundwater resources to maintain or improve water quality according to the classes, uses, and standards as enumerated in the State of Wyoming's Water Quality Rules and Regulations.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
To maintain the hydrologic condition needed to support riparian/wetland areas, minimize flood and sediment damage to water resources from human and natural causes, maintain and reduce current levels of salt loading in watersheds that lie within the Colorado River Basin, and to protect water resources used by the public and by federal, state, and local agencies for fisheries, wildlife, livestock, agricultural, recreational, municipal, and industrial uses.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
To maintain or enhance soil stability, productivity, and infiltration to prevent accelerated erosion and to provide for optimal plant growth.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
<b>Management Actions by Alternative</b>			
<b>Produced Water from Oil and Gas Activities</b>			
Surface discharge of produced water that meets State standards for water quality would be allowed in the Colorado River Basin. Individual projects would be considered on a site-specific basis.	Same as Alternative 1.	Surface discharge of produced water would not be allowed in the Colorado River Basin. Injection of produced water from Federal oil and gas leases would be required in the Colorado River Basin.	Surface discharge of produced water would not be approved for new projects in the Colorado River Basin. Existing surface discharges in the Colorado River Basin, approved under previous land use plans or authorizations, would be allowed to continue as long as they do not change or exceed water volumes or water quality specified during approval.

WATER QUALITY, WATERSHED AND SOILS MANAGEMENT			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)
Surface discharge of produced water that meets State standards and beneficial use for water quality would be allowed in the North Platte River Basin and Great Divide Basin.	Same as Alternative 1.	Only State of Wyoming-authorized water discharges of produced water that meets specific BLM land use objectives (e.g., providing water sources to meet livestock and wildlife management goals and/or water use for the protection or enhancement of wetland and riparian areas) would be allowed in the North Platte River Basin and Great Divide Basin.	Same as Alternative 1.
<b>Surface Disturbance and Permanent Structures in Waterways</b>	<b>Same as Alternative 1.</b>	Surface disturbing activities would not be allowed in the following areas: (1) identified 100-year flood plains, (2) areas within 500 feet from perennial waters, springs, wells, and wetland/riparian areas, and (3) areas 100 feet from the inner gorge of ephemeral channels.	Same as Alternative 1.
<b>Muddy Creek Watershed (USGS HUC 14050004)</b>	<b>Same as Alternative 1.</b>	Water impoundments in the Muddy Creek Watershed that result in a water depletion greater than one acre foot per individual project to the Colorado River system would not be allowed. (Map 2-20)	Same as Alternative 1.
<b>Encampment River Watershed (USGS HUC 10180000205)</b>	<b>Same as Alternative 1.</b>	Portions of the Encampment River Watershed would be protected by interim management prescriptions for the Encampment WSR and the Interim Management Policy for WSAs. (Map 2-20)	Same as Alternative 3.

		WILD HORSES	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)
Management Goals by Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Preferred Alternative)
To protect, maintain, and control a viable, healthy herd of wild horses while retaining their free-roaming nature and to provide adequate habitat for free-roaming wild horses through management consistent with environmental protection and enhancement policies.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
No similar action.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	To preserve and maintain the New World Iberian (Spanish Colonial) genotype and associated phenotype if these genetic characteristics are found to be significant through recognized means of genetic evaluation.	Same as Alternative 3.
<b>Management Actions by Alternative</b>	The AML for the Lost Creek HMA would remain at 70 adults. The AML was established in 1994 by extensive monitoring and evaluation (Map 2-21 and Appendix 12), and could change based on future monitoring.	Same as Alternative 1.	An interim population objective of 165 would be established for Lost Creek in order to preserve and enhance the New World Iberian genotype and associated phenotype. This interim population objective would be evaluated through genetic testing and habitat monitoring within five years to determine its effectiveness in achieving the objective.	Utilizing accepted means of genetic testing and analysis, in cooperation with the Lander and Rock Springs Field Offices, the total extent of the New World Iberian genotype within the metapopulation that includes the Lost Creek HMA (current AML of 70 adults) would be documented. Management practices would be implemented to accomplish the goal of preserving the New World Iberian genotype.

		WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES		
Management Goals by Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
To maintain or improve vegetation condition and/or avoid long-term disturbance in habitat sites for wildlife and fish species. Provide habitat quality and quantity adequate to support a natural diversity of wildlife and fish species. Maintain and enhance habitats sufficient to fulfill the life history requirements of a diversity of wildlife and fish species on public lands.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	To maintain or improve vegetation condition and/or reduce long-term disturbance in habitat sites for wildlife and fish species. Provide habitat quality and quantity adequate to support a natural diversity of wildlife and fish species. Maintain and enhance habitats sufficient to fulfill the life history requirements of a diversity of wildlife and fish species on public lands.
To maintain and enhance aquatic and wildlife resources and provide for biological diversity of plants and wildlife resources while ensuring healthy ecosystems.	To maintain and enhance aquatic and wildlife resources and provide for biological diversity of plants and wildlife resources while ensuring healthy ecosystems to the extent possible while maximizing commodity production.	To enhance aquatic and wildlife resources and provide for biological diversity of plants and wildlife resources while ensuring healthy ecosystems.	To enhance aquatic and wildlife resources and provide for biological diversity of plants and wildlife resources while ensuring healthy ecosystems.	Same as Alternative 1.
<b>Management Actions by Alternative</b>		Note: See Table 2-10 for seasonal restrictions for wildlife on surface disturbing and disruptive activities.		
Wildlife habitat objectives would be considered in all reclamation activity. Priority would be given to meeting Standards for Healthy Rangelands (BLM 1997) (Appendix 8 and Appendix 26).	Same as Alternative 1.	Wildlife habitat objectives would be considered for all surface disturbing and disruptive activities. Priority would be given to meeting DPC for wildlife habitat (Appendix 8 and Appendix 26).	Wildlife habitat objectives would be considered for all surface disturbing and disruptive activities. Priority would be given to meeting DPC for wildlife habitat (Appendix 8 and Appendix 26).	Same as Alternative 3.
As proposals are submitted, animal damage control activities in the RMPPA, including the use of lethal poisons, would be considered. These activities are subject to established policies, including NEPA requirements. These activities are also subject to the RFO Annual Predator Damage Management Plan, which is maintained current and consistent with those procedures and policies.	Same as Alternative 1.	Animal damage control activities would not be allowed.	Animal damage control activities would not be allowed.	Same as Alternative 1.

WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
Surface disturbing and disruptive activities potentially disruptive to nesting raptors are prohibited within the following distances during the following time periods:	<p>1-mile buffer: golden eagle, ferruginous hawk</p> <p><math>\frac{3}{4}</math>-mile buffer: barn owl, red-tailed hawk, great-horned owl, osprey, merlin, sharp-shinned hawk, kestrel, prairie falcon, northern harrier, Swainson's hawk, Cooper's hawk, short-eared owl, long-eared owl, peregrine falcon, screech owl, burrowing owl, northern goshawk, and other raptors</p>	<p>Surface disturbing and disruptive activities potentially disruptive to nesting raptors are prohibited within <math>1\frac{1}{2}</math> miles of a raptor nest during the following time periods for the protection of raptor nesting areas:</p> <p>1-mile buffer: golden eagle and ferruginous hawk.</p> <p><math>\frac{3}{4}</math>-mile buffer: barn owl, red-tailed hawk, great-horned owl, osprey, merlin, sharp-shinned hawk, kestrel, prairie falcon, northern harrier</p> <p>All others <math>\frac{3}{4}</math> mile;</p>	<p>Surface disturbing and disruptive activities potentially disruptive to nesting raptors are prohibited within <math>1\frac{1}{2}</math> miles of a raptor nest during the following time periods during the following time periods:</p> <p>1-mile buffer: golden eagle and ferruginous hawk.</p> <p><math>\frac{3}{4}</math>-mile buffer: barn owl, red-tailed hawk, great-horned owl, osprey, merlin, sharp-shinned hawk, kestrel, prairie falcon, northern harrier</p> <p>All others <math>\frac{3}{4}</math> mile;</p>
Feb 1–July 31: all raptor species	<p>Feb 1–July 15: golden eagle, barn owl, red-tailed hawk, great-horned owl, other raptors</p> <p>April 1–July 31: osprey, merlin, sharp-shinned hawk, kestrel, prairie falcon, northern harrier, Swainson's hawk, Cooper's hawk</p> <p>March 1–July 31: short-eared owl, long-eared owl, ferruginous hawk, peregrine falcon, screech owl</p> <p>April 15–Sept. 15: burrowing owl</p> <p>April 1–Aug. 31: goshawk</p>	<p>Feb 1–July 15: golden eagle, barn owl, red-tailed hawk, great-horned owl, other raptors</p> <p>April 1–July 31: osprey, merlin, sharp-shinned hawk, kestrel, prairie falcon, northern harrier, Swainson's hawk, Cooper's hawk</p> <p>March 1–July 31: short-eared owl, long-eared owl, ferruginous hawk, peregrine falcon, screech owl</p> <p>April 15–Sept. 15: burrowing owl</p> <p>April 1–Aug. 31: goshawk</p>	<p>Feb 1–July 15: golden eagle, barn owl, red-tailed hawk, great-horned owl, other raptors</p> <p>April 1–July 31: osprey, merlin, sharp-shinned hawk, kestrel, prairie falcon, northern harrier, Swainson's hawk, Cooper's hawk</p> <p>March 1–July 31: short-eared owl, long-eared owl, ferruginous hawk, peregrine falcon, screech owl</p> <p>April 15–Sept. 15: burrowing owl</p> <p>April 1–Aug. 31: goshawk</p>
Well locations, roads, ancillary facilities, and other surface structures requiring a repeated human presence would not be allowed within 825 feet of active raptor nests (ferruginous hawks, 1,200 feet). Distance may vary depending on factors such as nest activity, species, natural topographic barriers, and line-of-sight distances.	Well locations, roads, ancillary facilities, and other surface structures requiring a repeated human presence would be allowed.	Well locations, roads, ancillary facilities, and other surface structures requiring a repeated human presence would not be allowed within $\frac{1}{4}$ mile (1,320 feet) of active raptor nests.	Same as Alternative 1.

WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES				
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	
RCAs would be open to oil and gas leasing. Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be intensively managed.	Same as Alternative 1.	RCAs would be closed to oil and gas leasing. Surface disturbing and disruptive activities in existing leases would be intensively managed.	Same as Alternative 1.	
Important waterfowl production areas, as they are identified, would be managed for proper functioning condition (PFC) of aquatic habitat and associated wetlands.	Same as Alternative 1.	Important waterfowl production areas, as they are identified, would be managed for DPC of aquatic habitat and associated wetlands.	Same as Alternative 3.	
Best Management Practices (BMP) (Appendix 13) would be applied to surface disturbing and disruptive activities to maintain or enhance neotropical and other migratory bird species and their habitats.	No similar action.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	
Surface disturbing activities and disruptive activities would be intensively managed to maintain or enhance upland game bird species and their habitats.	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be managed to maintain upland game bird species and their habitats.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	
No similar action.	No similar action.	No similar action.	Proposals for conducting year-long surface disturbing activities, including oil and gas drilling in big game winter ranges, sage-grouse seasonal use areas, and other seasonally sensitive habitats and areas, would be considered if cumulative (environmental) impact analysis of proposed activities indicates a net environmental benefit within the RMPPA. Approval of such activities in all seasonally sensitive areas would be considered a modification of lease seasonal stipulations or APD conditions of approval (Appendix 27).	

WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES				
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	
No similar action.	No similar action.	Surface disturbing or disruptive activities within big game crucial winter range would require the use of best management practices designed to reduce the amount of human presence and activity during the winter months (Appendix 15).	Same as Alternative 3.	Same as Alternative 3.
Surface disturbing and disruptive activities within big game crucial winter range would not be allowed during the period of November 15 to April 30. (Maps 2-53, 2-54 and 2-55)	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities within big game crucial winter range would be allowed during the period of November 15 to April 30.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
Surface disturbing and disruptive activities within identified big game partition areas would not be allowed during the period of May 1 to June 30 (Maps 2-55, 2-56).	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities within identified big game partition areas would be allowed during the period of May 1 to June 30 (Maps 2-55, 2-56).	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be prohibited within identified big game partition areas (Maps 2-55, 2-56).	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be prohibited within identified big game partition areas (Maps 2-55, 2-56).	Same as Alternative 1.
No similar action.	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be allowed in big game migration and transitional ranges.	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be managed, on a case-by-case basis, in identified big game migration and transitional ranges to maintain their integrity and function for big game species in these areas.	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be managed, on a case-by-case basis, in identified big game migration and transitional ranges to maintain their integrity and function for big game species in these areas.	Same as Alternative 3.
Fences identified to be a problem to big game migration would be modified to meet BLM fence standards. New fences would be allowed in big game migration corridors and would meet current BLM fence standards.	Fences would not be modified in big game migration areas. New fences would be allowed in big game migration corridors and would meet current BLM fence standards.	All existing fences would be modified to meet BLM fence standards. New fences would not be allowed in big game migration corridors.	All existing fences would be modified to meet BLM fence standards. New fences would not be allowed in big game migration corridors.	Same as Alternative 1.

<b>WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES</b>				
<b>Alternative 1</b>	<b>Alternative 2</b>	<b>Alternative 3</b>	<b>Alternative 4</b>	
Water developments for livestock and wild horse use would be allowed in crucial winter range when they are consistent with wildlife habitat needs.	Water developments for livestock and wild horse use would be allowed in crucial winter range.	Water developments for livestock and wild horse use would not be allowed in crucial winter range.	Same as Alternative 1.	
Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be intensively managed to maintain or enhance amphibian species and their habitats.	No similar action.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	
For the protection of amphibian species and their habitats, surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be avoided in the following areas: (1) identified 100-year flood plains, (2) areas within 500 feet from perennial waters, springs, wells, and wetlands, and (3) areas 100 feet from the inner gorge of ephemeral channels.	Same as Alternative 1.	For the protection of amphibian species and their habitats, surface disturbing and disruptive activities would not be allowed in the following areas: (1) identified 100-year flood plains, (2) areas within 500 feet from perennial waters, springs, wells, and wetlands, and (3) areas 100 feet from the inner gorge of ephemeral channels.	Same as Alternative 1.	
Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be managed to maintain or enhance reptile species and their habitats.	No similar action.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	
<b>Fish Habitat</b>				
Fish habitats would be managed to achieve PFC.	Same as Alternative 1.	All priority fish habitats would be managed to achieve their potential natural condition (Appendix 13).	Fish habitats would be managed to achieve DFC.	
Where possible, impoundments and instream structures would be designed to reduce impacts on special status fish species and their habitats.	Same as Alternative 1.	Impoundments and instream structures would not be allowed where negative effects on habitat quality, habitat quantity, or the life cycle requirements of populations of special status fish species would occur.	Impoundments and instream structures would be designed to minimize impacts on special status fish species and their habitats.	
Road crossings of water bodies that potentially support fish would be designed to allow fish passage.	Same as Alternative 1.	Road crossings of water bodies that potentially support fish for a portion of the year would be designed to simulate natural stream processes.	Same as Alternative 3.	

WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES				
	Alternative 1	Alternative 2 Endangered (E), Threatened (T), Proposed (P), and Candidate (C) Species	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
If prairie dog towns/complexes suitable as black-footed ferret habitat are present at the proposed project level, attempts would be made to locate all project components outside of these towns/complexes to avoid direct impacts on the towns, or a black-footed ferret survey would be required.	Same as Alternative 1	If prairie dog town(s)/complexes suitable as black-footed ferret habitat were present at the proposed project level, surface disturbing or disruptive activities would be avoided within 164 feet (50 meters).	Same as Alternative 3.	
Surface disturbing and disruptive activities potentially disruptive to nesting bald eagles are prohibited within 1 mile of a bald eagle nest from February 1 to July 31.	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities potentially disruptive to nesting bald eagles are prohibited within $\frac{1}{2}$ mile of a bald eagle nest from February 1 to July 15.	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities potentially disruptive to nesting bald eagles are prohibited within $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles of a bald eagle nest from February 1 to July 15.	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities potentially disruptive to nesting bald eagles are prohibited within 1 mile of a bald eagle nest from February 1 to July 15.	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities potentially disruptive to nesting bald eagles are prohibited within 1 mile of a bald eagle nest from February 1 to July 15.

WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
No similar action.	Same as Alternative 1.	<p>Activities and habitat alterations that may disturb bald eagles will be restricted within suitable habitats that occur within bald eagle buffer zones:</p> <p>Zone 1: (within <math>\frac{1}{2}</math> mile 1 February to 15 August) is intended to protect active and alternative nests. For active nests, minimal human activity levels are allowed during the period of first occupancy to 2 weeks after fledging.</p> <p>Zone 2: (within <math>\frac{1}{2}</math> to 1 mile from the nest) is intended to protect bald eagle primary use areas and permits light human activity levels.</p> <p>Zone 3: is designated to protect foraging/concentration areas year-round. This zone would include one of two larger areas, depending on habitat types: (1) 2.5 miles extending in all directions from the nest; and (2) <math>\frac{1}{2}</math> mile from the streambank of all streams within 2.5 miles of the nest. Site-specific habitat types and foraging areas will be evaluated to determine which Zone 3 buffer applies. Zone delineation depends on habitat types. Exceptions may be made after consultation with the USFWS.</p>	Same as Alternative 3.
Boat and raft landing areas would not be developed and outfitting camps would be avoided in Western yellow-billed cuckoo habitat, when possible.	Same as Alternative 1	Boat and raft landing areas would not be developed and outfitting camps would be prohibited in Western yellow-billed cuckoo habitat.	Same as Alternative 3.

WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES				
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	
Surface disturbing and disruptive activities potentially disruptive to Western yellow-billed cuckoos would not be prohibited within ½ mile of identified habitat from April 15 to August 15 for the protection of nesting Western yellow-billed cuckoos.	Same as Alternative 1	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities potentially disruptive to Western yellow-billed cuckoos would be prohibited within ½ mile of identified habitat from April 15 to August 15 for the protection of nesting Western yellow-billed cuckoos.	Same as Alternative 3.	
The use of malathion, or other pesticides, would be authorized near Wyoming toad occupied habitats, on a case-by-case basis.	Same as Alternative 1	The use of malathion, or other pesticides, would not be authorized near Wyoming toad occupied habitats.	Same as Alternative 1.	
Disposal of BLM-administered public lands that contain habitat necessary to accomplish the recovery of the Wyoming toad would be avoided.	Same as Alternative 1	BLM-administered public lands that contain habitat necessary to accomplish recovery of the Wyoming toad would not be exchanged or sold.	Same as Alternative 3.	
Any action that would result in stream channel instability, erosion, and sedimentation within known Western boreal toad habitat would be avoided.	Same as Alternative 1	Any action that could result in stream channel instability, erosion, and sedimentation within known Western boreal toad habitat would not be authorized, unless there is a benefit to the species.	Same as Alternative 1.	
<b>Species Listed on the BLM Wyoming State Director's Sensitive Species List</b>				
Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be intensively managed to minimize impacts on identified crucial habitat for sensitive species for the purpose of protecting these species and their associated habitats (Appendix 15).	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be allowed in identified crucial habitat for sensitive species for the purpose of protecting these species and their associated habitats (Appendix 15).	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be prohibited in identified crucial habitat for sensitive species for the purpose of protecting these species and their associated habitats (Appendix 15).	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be prohibited in identified crucial habitat for sensitive species for the purpose of protecting these species and their associated habitats (Appendix 15).	Same as Alternative 1.
Surface disturbing and disruptive activities in white-tailed and black-tailed prairie dog towns would be avoided.	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be allowed to occur in white-tailed and black-tailed prairie dog towns.	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be prohibited within 50 meters (164 feet) of identified white-tailed and black-tailed prairie dog towns.	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be prohibited within 50 meters (164 feet) of identified white-tailed and black-tailed prairie dog towns.	Same as Alternative 1.
Prairie dog poisoning would be allowed in white-tailed and black-tailed prairie dog towns and complexes in accordance to existing, RFO APDMP.	Same as Alternative 1.	Prairie dog poisoning would be prohibited in white-tailed and black-tailed prairie dog towns/complexes, except for demonstrated reasons of human health and safety.	Same as Alternative 3.	

WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES				
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	
Above ground facilities within $\frac{1}{4}$ mile of prairie dog towns would not be equipped with anti-raptor perching devices.	Same as Alternative 1.	No above ground facilities would be allowed within $\frac{1}{4}$ mile of prairie dog towns, unless the facilities are equipped with anti-raptor perching devices.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would avoid black-tailed prairie dog towns.	Same as Alternative 1.	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be prohibited within 50 meters (164 feet) of black-tailed prairie dog towns.	Same as Alternative 1.	Placement of power poles within prairie dog towns would be avoided; however, in the event that power poles are required to be placed within these towns, raptor anti-perch devices would be required.
Power poles within prairie dog towns would be equipped with raptor anti-perch devices.	Same as Alternative 1	Power poles would not be allowed within prairie dog towns.		
No similar action.	No similar action.	Surface disturbing or disruptive activities within Greater sage-grouse breeding or nesting habitat would require the use of best management practices designed to reduce both the direct loss of habitat and disturbance to the birds during the critical breeding and nesting seasons (Appendix 15).	Same as Alternative 3.	Location of high profile structures (e.g. buildings, storage tanks, overhead power lines, wind turbines, towers, and windmills) would be prohibited within 1 mile of an active Greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse lek.
High profile structures (e.g. buildings, storage tanks, overhead power lines, wind turbines, towers, and windmills) would be authorized within 1 mile of an active Greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse lek.	Same as Alternative 1.	High profile structures (e.g. buildings, storage tanks, overhead power lines, wind turbines, towers, and windmills) would be prohibited within 1 mile of an active Greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse lek.	Same as Alternative 4.	Greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse lek.

WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
Surface disturbing and disruptive activities located within a 1/4 mile of a known Greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse lek would be allowed; however, the project would be located in the least disruptive location from the lek, on a case-by-case basis. Surface disturbing and disruptive activities potentially disruptive to breeding and nesting Greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse are not prohibited within a 2-mile radius of the center of a Greater sage-grouse lek, and 1-mile radius of the center of a sharp-tailed grouse lek from March 1 to June 30.	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities located within a 1/4 mile of a known Greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse lek would be allowed; however, the project would be located in the least disruptive location from the lek, on a case-by-case basis. Surface disturbing and disruptive activities potentially disruptive to breeding and nesting Greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse are not prohibited within a 2-mile radius of the center of a Greater sage-grouse lek, and 1-mile radius of the center of a sharp-tailed grouse lek from March 1 to June 30.	The following would occur in Greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse leks: (1) prohibit surface-disturbance or occupancy within 1/4 mile of the perimeter of occupied Greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse leks; and (2) avoid human activity between 6:00 p.m. and 9:00 a.m. from March 1 –May 20 within 1/4 mile of the perimeter of occupied Greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse leks. The following would occur in Greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse nesting/early brood-rearing habitat: avoid surface disturbing and disruptive activities, geophysical surveys, and organized recreational activities (events) which require a special use permit in suitable Greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse nesting and early brood-rearing habitat within 2 miles of an occupied Greater sage-grouse lek, and 1 mile of a sharp-tailed grouse lek, or in identified Greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse nesting and early brood-rearing habitat outside the 2 miles, or 1 mile, buffer from March 15 –July 15.	Same as Alternative 3.

<b>WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES</b>			
<b>Alternative 1</b>	<b>Alternative 2</b>	<b>Alternative 3</b>	<b>Alternative 4</b>
In the area east of State Highway 789, south of Interstate 80, west of State Highway 71 and Carbon County Road 401, and north of State Highway 70, surface disturbing and disruptive activities potentially disruptive to breeding and nesting Greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse are prohibited within a 2-mile radius of the center of a Greater sage-grouse lek, and within a 1-mile radius of the center of a sharp-tailed grouse lek from March 1 to June 30.	In the area east of State Highway 789, south of Interstate 80, west of State Highway 71 and Carbon County Road 401, and north of State Highway 70, the following would occur: Greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse leks: (1) prohibit surface-disturbance or occupancy within $\frac{1}{4}$ mile of the perimeter of occupied Greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse leks; and (2) avoid human activity between 6:00 p.m. and 9:00 a.m. from March 1 to May 20 within $\frac{1}{4}$ mile of the perimeter of occupied Greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse leks.	In the area east of State Highway 789, south of Interstate 80, west of State Highway 71 and Carbon County Road 401, and north of State Highway 70, the following would occur: Greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse leks: (1) prohibit surface-disturbance or occupancy within $\frac{1}{4}$ mile of the perimeter of occupied Greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse leks; and (2) avoid human activity between 6:00 p.m. and 9:00 a.m. from March 1 to May 20 within $\frac{1}{4}$ mile of the perimeter of occupied Greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse leks.	In the area east of State Highway 789, south of Interstate 80, west of State Highway 71 and Carbon County Road 401, and north of State Highway 70, the following would occur: Greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse leks: (1) prohibit surface-disturbance or occupancy within $\frac{1}{4}$ mile of the perimeter of occupied Greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse leks; and (2) avoid human activity between 6:00 p.m. and 9:00 a.m. from March 1 to May 20 within $\frac{1}{4}$ mile of the perimeter of occupied Greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse leks.
Surface disturbing and disruptive activities potentially disruptive to delineated Greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse winter concentration areas are prohibited during the period of November 15 to April 30 for the protection of Greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse winter concentration areas.	No similar action.	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities potentially disruptive to delineated Greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse winter concentration areas are prohibited during the period of November 15 to March 14 for the protection of Greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse winter concentration areas.	Same as Alternative 3.

**Table 2-2. Proposed Withdrawals**

Proposed Withdrawal	Acres <sup>2</sup>			
	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
Encampment River Campground	10	10	10	10
Corral Creek Recreation Site	10	10	10	10
Bennett Peak Recreation Site	20	20	20	20
Teton Reservoir Recreation Site	350	350	350	350
Prior Flat Campground	90	90	90	90
Dugway Recreation Site	40	40	40	40
Nine Mile Hill Recreation Site	130	130	130	130
Fort Washakie Stage Station	130	130	130	130
Sage Creek Stage Station	N/A	N/A	120	120
Midway Stage Station	N/A	N/A	110	110
All Historic Trails	N/A	N/A	66,260	N/A
Overland Trail	680	680	N/A	N/A
Big Creek Proposed Recreation Site	30	30	30	30
Prospect Creek Proposed Recreation Site	20	20	20	20
Gibben's Beardtongue Site	15	15	15	15
Como Bluff ACEC	N/A	N/A	1690	N/A
Sand Hills ACEC	N/A	N/A	12,700	N/A
Stratton Hydrology Research Area	5,530	5,530	5,530	5,530
Chain Lakes Habitat Management Area	N/A	N/A	30,560	N/A
Red Rim - Daley Habitat Management Area	N/A	N/A	15,980	N/A
Wick-Beumee Wildlife Habitat Management Area	N/A	N/A	280	280
Shirley Mountain Bat Cave Habitat Management Area	N/A	240	520	240
Laramie Plains Lakes Area ACEC	N/A	N/A	1,600	1,600
Blowout Penstemon Site	N/A	N/A	4,040	4,040
Upper Muddy Creek Watershed/Grizzly ACEC	N/A	N/A	70,780	N/A
High Savery Dam Reservoir Habitat Management Area	N/A	N/A	530	N/A
Continental Divide National Scenic Trail-CDNST	N/A	N/A	600	600
North Platte River SRMA	N/A	N/A	12,740	N/A
Encampment River WSR	620	620	620	620
Rim Lake Recreation Site	N/A	N/A	70	N/A
Shirley Basin Reservoir	N/A	N/A	90	N/A
Jep Canyon Wildlife Habitat Management Area	N/A	N/A	13,810	N/A
Shamrock Hills ACEC	N/A	N/A	18,400	N/A
Total Withdrawals	7,675	7,915	257,875	13,985

<sup>2</sup> Acres may not add due to overlaps

**Table 2-3. Current ROW Corridors**

Current ROW Corridors <sup>1</sup>	Total Nominal Width
Exxon/Frontier Natural Gas Pipelines (multiple)	600 feet
Spence-Bairoil-Jim Bridger 230 kV Transmission Line	600 feet
CIG Natural Gas Pipeline	2 miles
Lost Creek Natural Gas Pipeline	600 feet
Sinclair Natural Gas Pipelines (multiple)	600 feet
WAPA Power Line	600 feet
1-80 Corridor (pipelines, public utilities, roads)	4 miles

**Table 2-4. Summary Comparison of Impacts**

SUMMARY COMPARISON OF IMPACTS				
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Preferred)	
<b>Impacts on Air Quality</b>				
There would be an increase in emissions of carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen oxides ( $\text{NO}_x$ ), sulfur dioxide ( $\text{SO}_2$ ), $\text{PM}_{10}$ , and $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ , volatile organic compounds (VOC) and hazardous air pollutants (HAP), but none of these increases would cause any exceedance of state or federal ambient air quality standards.	Impacts under this alternative would be the same as under Alternative 1. Qualitative emissions projections show that the total emissions would increase over time from 12,912 tons per year of pollutants in the base year to 39,974 tons per year by 2023; the highest of any alternative.	Impacts under this alternative would be similar to those under Alternative 1. Qualitative emissions projections show that the total emissions would increase over time from 12,912 tons per year of pollutants in the base year to 31,875 tons per year by 2023; the lowest of any alternative.	Impacts under this alternative would be similar to those under Alternative 1.	Qualitative emissions projections show that the total emissions would increase over time from 12,912 tons per year of pollutants in the base year to 36,982 tons per year by 2023.
<b>Impacts on Cultural Resources</b>				
Disturbance of approximately 98,339 acres (from forest, lands and realty, livestock and minerals management actions) would potentially impact an estimated 891 cultural sites eligible for the NRHP.	Disturbance of approximately 98,793 acres (from forest, lands and realty, livestock, and minerals management actions) would potentially impact an estimated 895 cultural sites eligible for the NRHP.	Disturbance of approximately 92,719 acres (from forest, lands and realty, livestock, and minerals management actions) would potentially impact an estimated 840 cultural sites eligible for the NRHP.	Disturbance of approximately 87,583 acres (from forest, lands and realty, livestock, and minerals management actions) would potentially impact an estimated 794 cultural sites eligible for the NRHP.	Disturbance of approximately 87,583 acres (from forest, lands and realty, livestock, and minerals management actions) would potentially impact an estimated 794 cultural sites eligible for the NRHP.
VRM Class I areas, SMAs, and NSO stipulations would protect 79,560 acres from surface disturbing activities, providing indirect protection to cultural resource sites.	VRM Class II designation of 233,950 acres would provide indirect protection to cultural resource sites.	VRM Class I areas, SMAs, and NSO stipulations would protect 75,920 acres from surface disturbing activities, providing indirect protection to cultural resource sites.	VRM Class II designation of 941,810 acres would provide indirect protection to cultural resource sites.	VRM Class I areas, SMAs, and NSO stipulations would protect 222,070 acres from surface disturbing activities, providing indirect protection to cultural resource sites.
VRM Class II designation of 359,610 acres would provide indirect protection to the setting of Native American sacred sites, traditional cultural properties, and other cultural properties where the setting contributes to their NRHP eligibility.	VRM Class II designation of 589,530 acres would provide indirect protection to the setting of Native American sacred sites, traditional cultural properties, and other cultural properties where the setting contributes to their NRHP eligibility.	VRM Class II designation of 589,530 acres would provide indirect protection to the setting of Native American sacred sites, traditional cultural properties, and other cultural properties where the setting contributes to their NRHP eligibility.	VRM Class II designation of 589,530 acres would provide indirect protection to the setting of Native American sacred sites, traditional cultural properties, and other cultural properties where the setting contributes to their NRHP eligibility.	VRM Class II designation of 589,530 acres would provide indirect protection to the setting of Native American sacred sites, traditional cultural properties, and other cultural properties where the setting contributes to their NRHP eligibility.

SUMMARY COMPARISON OF IMPACTS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Preferred)
<b>Impacts on Fire and Fuels</b>			
Vegetation treatments (2,500 acres/year) would not be adequate to create the diversity of serial stages necessary to decrease the potential for wildland fires.  Using wildland fire for resource benefit would reintroduce fire, reducing large fire suppression efforts over the long term.	The increase in vegetation and weed treatments (24,400 acres/year) would reduce the annual size of wildland fires to an estimated 2,000 acres.  Emphasis on fire suppression of all wildland fires would limit the reintroduction of wildland fire, increasing the need for and complexity of rehabilitation and restoration.	A large number of smaller vegetation treatments (11,800 acres/year) would increase the mosaic vegetation patterns but would not be adequate to slow the spread of wildland fires, or to reduce potential fire size and intensity.  Emphasis on the use of wildland fire for resource benefit could achieve the goal of reintroduction of the role of wildland fire into fire-dependent ecosystems.	Vegetation treatments (an estimated 16,400 acres/year) would create more diverse vegetation communities in treated areas and reduce the size and intensity of wildland fires.  Emphasis on the use of wildland fire for resource benefit would result in an increase in fuels treatments, creating more diverse vegetation communities in treated areas, and reducing the size and intensity of wildland fires.
<b>Impacts on Forest Resources</b>			
The overall health of timber stands would be improved through increased access and forest management actions.  There would be some loss of harvestable acreage from minerals, OHV, and cultural resource management actions.	Impacts under this alternative would be similar to those under Alternative 1, except access to isolated parcels would not be pursued, potentially reducing overall forest health in localized areas. Also, fewer VRM restrictions would result in more timber available for harvest.	Impacts under this alternative would be similar to those under Alternative 1, except the use of wildland fire for resource benefit would result in improved forest health. Also, there would be no commercial timber available for harvest.	Reductions in commercial harvest would require other forest management practices to improve forest health.  Impacts under this alternative would be similar to those under Alternative 1, except that there would be more timber available for harvest with fewer VRM restrictions. Also, restrictions on timber harvest within $\frac{1}{4}$ mile of the Shirley Mountain Bat Cave ACEC and along steep slopes would reduce the acres available for timber harvest.

SUMMARY COMPARISON OF IMPACTS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Preferred)
<b>Impacts on Lands and Realty</b>  There would be no reduction in ROW authorizations and development activities. The protection of sensitive resources would greatly influence the location, opportunity, and timing of ROVs and other land and realty authorized facilities.  No significant impacts would occur to the lands and realty program.  Withdrawals of approximately 8,105 acres would be proposed.	Impacts under this alternative would be the same as under Alternative 1. Withdrawals of approximately 8,825 acres would be proposed.	Impacts under this alternative would be similar to those under Alternative 1, except there would be a slight reduction in ROW authorizations and development activities.  Withdrawals of approximately 402,280 acres would be proposed.	Impacts under this alternative would be similar to those under Alternative 1, except there would be no substantial reduction in land tenure adjustments.  Withdrawals of approximately 34,024 acres would be proposed.
<b>Impacts on Livestock Grazing</b>  The proliferation of noxious and invasive weeds and the lack of weed treatments under this alternative would result in a significant loss of forage (and ultimately AUMs).  Forage loss from surface disturbance would result in a loss of 1,860 AUMs.	Long-term forage quality and quantity would be improved, as a result of substantial increases in both vegetation and noxious and invasive weed treatments.  Forage loss from surface disturbance would result in a loss of 1,880 AUMs.	Long-term forage quality would be improved as a result of managing for DPC and increased vegetation and noxious and invasive weed treatments.  Forage loss from surface disturbance would result in a loss of 1,730 AUMs.  The loss of up to 30,000 AUMs resulting from a lack of predator control and the increase of wild horses in the Lost Creek HMA would create a significant impact.	Long-term forage quality would be improved as a result of managing for DPC and increased vegetation and noxious and invasive weed treatments.  Forage loss from surface disturbance would result in a loss of 1,730 AUMs.  The loss of up to 30,000 AUMs resulting from a lack of predator control and the increase of wild horses in the Lost Creek HMA would create a significant impact.

SUMMARY COMPARISON OF IMPACTS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Preferred)
<b>Impacts on Minerals</b>			
Implementation of restrictions on surface disturbing and other disruptive activities would limit oil and gas development and activities. An estimated 8,945 wells would be developed during the planning period.	Fewer restrictions on surface disturbing and other disruptive activities would allow more time to develop wells and construct facilities resulting in an increase of leasing and drilling activities. An estimated 9,198 wells would be developed during the planning period.	An increase in restrictions on surface disturbing and other disruptive activities would limit the time available to develop wells and construct ancillary facilities, resulting in a decrease of leasing and drilling activities. An estimated 8,632 wells would be developed during the planning period.	An increase in restrictions on surface disturbing and other disruptive activities would limit the time available to develop wells and construct ancillary facilities, resulting in a decrease of leasing and drilling activities. An estimated 8,822 wells would be developed during the planning period.
Closing about 8,105 acres to locatable mineral entry and mineral material disposals would limit the amount of land available for development.	Closing about 8,825 acres to locatable mineral entry and mineral material disposals would limit the amount of land available for development.	Closing about 402,280 acres to locatable mineral entry and mineral material disposals would limit the amount of land available for development.	Closing about 28,724 acres to locatable mineral entry and mineral material disposals would limit the amount of land available for development.
<b>Impacts on Off-Highway Vehicle Management</b>			
Long-term impacts on OHV use would likely occur in sensitive resource areas as a result of road closures and restrictions.	Long-term impacts on OHV use would likely occur in sensitive resource areas as a result of road closures and restrictions; however, they would be less than those identified in Alternative 1 as a result of reduced restrictions in big game crucial winter range and partition areas.	This alternative provides the greatest protection to resources that enhance the recreational OHV experience. As a result of this protection, many areas restrict or preclude OHV use, reducing OHV opportunities throughout the RMPPA.	To preserve some important resource values, some areas could limit or preclude OHV use. However, based on the anticipated amount of roads and vehicle routes that would remain available to OHV use within the RMPPA, these impacts would be negligible.
Closing Ferris Mountain WSA, High Savery Dam SMA, and Encampment River WSR (23,020 acres) would limit OHV opportunities.	Closing Ferris Mountain WSA, High Savery Dam SMA, and Encampment River WSR (23,020 acres) would limit OHV opportunities.	Impacts would occur on OHV users seeking open, unconfined OHV opportunities because the Dune Ponds OHV area, all WSAs, and the High Savery Dam ACEC would be closed to off-road use (71,980 acres).	Impacts under this alternative would be similar to those under Alternative 1, except that the Adobe Town 1, would be limited to designated roads and vehicle routes (34,030 acres).
<b>Impacts on Paleontology</b>			
98,339 acres of surface disturbing activities could damage and/or dislocate resources through unanticipated discoveries.	Impacts under this alternative would be similar to those under Alternative 1, except that 98,793 acres would be disturbed.	Impacts under this alternative would be similar to those under Alternative 1, except that 92,719 acres would be disturbed.	Impacts under this alternative would be similar to those under Alternative 1, except that 87,583 acres would be disturbed.

SUMMARY COMPARISON OF IMPACTS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Preferred)
<b>Impacts on Recreation Resources</b>			
Impacts on wildlife and fish would potentially impact recreation opportunities.	Impacts on wildlife and fish would potentially impact recreation opportunities.	Minimal impacts would occur to recreation management under this alternative.	Similar to Alternative 1, minimal impacts would occur to recreation management under this alternative. Also, conflicting uses from motorized vehicle users and recreationists seeking solitude and natural settings for recreational activities would likely occur as a result of the anticipated increase in OHV use.
Conflicting uses from motorized vehicle users and recreationists seeking solitude and natural settings for recreational activities would likely occur as a result of the anticipated increase in OHV use.	Similar to Alternative 1, conflicting uses from motorized vehicle users and recreationists seeking solitude and natural settings for recreational activities would likely occur as a result of the anticipated increase in OHV use.	Similar to Alternative 1, conflicting uses from motorized vehicle users and recreationists seeking solitude and natural settings for recreational activities would likely occur as a result of the anticipated increase in OHV use.	Similar to Alternative 1, minimal impacts would occur to recreation management under this alternative. Also, conflicting uses from motorized vehicle users and recreationists seeking solitude and natural settings for recreational activities would likely occur as a result of the anticipated increase in OHV use.
<b>Impacts on Socioeconomics</b>			
Continued management actions within the RMPPA are expected to support jobs and income in the local economy, with most employment opportunities occurring in western portions of the RMPPA.	Increased oil and gas development is expected to have positive economic impacts in the form of increased employment, earnings, and mineral tax revenues. Negative impacts could occur on certain social activities as a result of a decline in wildlife resources. Increases in population could lead to greater demands on government services in certain parts of the study area.	Restrictions on oil and gas development are expected to have negative economic impacts as a result of potential declines in employment, earnings, and mineral tax revenues. Positive impacts are likely to occur to certain social activities as a result of increased protection of wildlife resources. Population trends in western portions of the study area may be impacted while future mineral ad valorem taxes are expected to decline.	Impacts under this alternative would be the same as under Alternative 1.
Continuation of management actions is expected to contribute to changes in population trends and government services.	Increases in ad valorem taxes are expected to be significant toward the later part of the study period.		
<b>Impacts on Special Management Areas</b>			
<b>Wilderness Study Areas</b>			
Management actions in the IMP would result in negligible impacts to wilderness characteristics.	Impacts under this alternative would be the same as under Alternative 1.	Impacts under this alternative would be the same as under Alternative 1.	Impacts under this alternative would be the same as under Alternative 1.
<b>Como Bluff Area</b>			
Significant impacts would not be expected to occur because the level of development and activity that would occur in the ACEC/NNL would be compatible with the objectives and management prescriptions for the area.	The area would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area. Impacts under this alternative would be the same as under Alternative 1.	The area would be managed as an ACEC. Although additional protections are afforded, impacts under this alternative would be the same as under Alternative 1.	The area would be managed as a national natural landmark (NNL). Impacts under this alternative would be the same as under Alternative 1.

SUMMARY COMPARISON OF IMPACTS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Preferred)
<b>Sand Hills Area and Potential JO Ranch Expansion</b>			
Surface disturbing activities would impact the area by removing and degrading portions of the unique bitterbrush/big sagebrush vegetation community.  The values of the area would be protected only within the existing ACEC boundaries.	Managing the area for multiple use would result in significant loss of relevant and important values.	Impacts under this alternative would be similar to those under Alternative 1, except implementation of intensive restrictions on surface disturbing and other disruptive activities would result in the greatest level of protection to the unique vegetation community.  Incorporating the JO Ranch Expansion into the ACEC would provide additional protection to the unique values of the area.	Impacts under this alternative would be similar to those under Alternative 1, except implementation of additional restrictions on surface disturbing and other disruptive activities would reduce impacts.  Also, similar to Alternative 3, incorporating the JO Ranch Expansion into the ACEC would provide additional protection to the unique values of the area.
<b>Jep Canyon Area</b>			
The relevant and important values of the ACEC would be protected.  Surface disturbing and other disruptive activities from mineral development would not significantly impact crucial elk winter range or the productivity of raptor nesting pairs because of restrictions and mitigation that would be applied under this alternative.	The ACEC designation would not be maintained.  Reduction in restrictions would decrease protection of aspen stands, crucial elk winter range, and the productivity of raptor nesting pairs	The area would be designated an ACEC.  Increased restrictions would increase protection of aspen stands, crucial elk winter range, and the productivity of raptor nesting pairs	The ACEC designation would not be maintained because of complexities associated with checkerboard land ownership.  Wildlife management actions identified under this alternative would reduce impacts to big game species, raptors, and other species and improve their habitat.
<b>Shamrock Hills Area</b>			
The Shamrock Hills ACEC would be maintained.  Existing wildlife restrictions would help reduce impacts; however, surface disturbing activities could impact the productivity of raptor nesting pairs.	The ACEC designation would not be maintained.  Impacts to the Shamrock Hills area from other management actions would be greatest under Alternative 2. Fewer stipulations placed on surface disturbing activities would impact the productivity of wildlife.	The ACEC designation would be maintained.  This alternative has more restrictive management for minerals and off-road management activities and off-road vehicular travel for "necessary tasks." Under this alternative, impacts to raptors and other wildlife within the area would be reduced.	The ACEC designation would not be maintained because of complexities of management associated with the checkerboard land ownership.  Wildlife restrictions and mineral management actions identified under this alternative would provide adequate protection to raptors and other species and improve their habitat.

SUMMARY COMPARISON OF IMPACTS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Preferred)
<b>Stratton Sagebrush Steppe Area</b>  The area would be managed as a research area. The research potential of the area could be compromised. Impacts would be significant because grazing and vegetation treatment actions may not be compatible with the research objectives and management prescriptions for the area.	Impacts under this alternative would be the same as under Alternative 1.	The area would be designated as an ACEC.  A lower level of surface disturbance from grazing and vegetation treatment actions under this alternative would reduce related impacts. Significant impacts would not be expected to occur because the types of disturbances from BLM-approved activities would be compatible with the research goals for the area.	The area would be managed as a research area.  A lower level of surface disturbance grazing and vegetation treatment actions under this alternative would reduce related impacts. Significant impacts would not be expected to occur because the types of disturbances from BLM-approved activities would be compatible with the research goals for the area.
<b>Chain Lakes Area</b>  The area would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area Mineral development activities and associated infrastructure would potentially result in significant impacts to the unique alkaline lake system.	The area would not be designated as an ACEC and would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area.  Mineral development activities and associated infrastructure would result in significant impacts to the unique alkaline lake system. Reductions in wildlife and surface disturbance restrictions would increase impacts.	The Chain Lakes Area would be designated as an ACEC.  The ACEC designation would restrict or prohibit new mineral development within the area, allowing for increased protection of the unique alkaline desert wetlands.	The area would not be designated as an ACEC and would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area.  Stipulations designed to protect wildlife habitat would be adequate but would not provide as much protection as under Alternative 3.

SUMMARY COMPARISON OF IMPACTS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Preferred)
<b>Laramie Peak Area</b>  The area would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area. Because of the proliferation of cheatgrass in disturbed areas and the dominance of late seral condition plant communities throughout, habitat and forage would be compromised.	The area would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area. Increased vegetation and weed treatments would maintain and enhance forage and habitat for wildlife and livestock. Not pursuing land tenure adjustments would reduce BLM's ability to effectively manage for wildlife objectives. Reduced restrictions on surface disturbing activities would increase the potential for forage loss, human-induced stress to wildlife species, and habitat fragmentation.	Laramie Peak would be designated as an ACEC.  Crucial habitat for bighorn sheep, elk, and mule deer would be afforded the greatest protection because of restrictions on surface disturbing activities. Relevant and important values would be conserved through management actions of other resource programs.	The area would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area. Vegetation treatments designed to achieve DPC, restrictions on surface disturbing activities, and restriction on off-road motorized vehicle use would benefit wildlife habitat used by big horn sheep, elk, and other big game animals.
<b>Red Rim-Daley Area</b>  The area would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area. Surface disturbing activities would result in localized habitat loss and degradation as well as short-term wildlife displacement. However, seasonal restrictions on surface disturbing activities would help reduce these impacts.	The area would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area. Surface disturbing activities would not be mitigated to the extent under Alternative 1, resulting in a potential loss of wildlife forage and habitat. A reduction in the timing stipulations would increase human-induced stress to wildlife species, potentially resulting in displacement.	The Red Rim-Daley Area would be designated as an ACEC.  Management objectives for the ACEC would be designed to minimize conflicts with adjacent landowners and enhance the natural resource values of the area. Increased restrictions on surface disturbing activities would reduce the loss of habitat and forage and stress to wildlife species. Pursuing land acquisitions would potentially result in contiguous management of wildlife habitat.	The area would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area. Restrictions on surface disturbing activities would reduce the loss of wildlife forage and habitat and stress to wildlife species during critical periods. Increased vegetation management actions would enhance wildlife habitat.

SUMMARY COMPARISON OF IMPACTS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Preferred)
<b>Pennock Mountain Area</b>  The area would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area. Seasonal restrictions would protect the area from disturbing activities during winter.	The area would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area. Seasonal restrictions would be less restrictive.  Impacts under this alternative would be the same as under Alternative 1. There would be no impacts to the continued ability of the unit to serve its intended purpose from any BLM program activity.	The area would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area. Restrictions on surface disturbing activities, reduced human presence during critical times, and using livestock as a management tool for wildlife objectives would provide protection of crucial winter habitat for elk and mule deer.	The area would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area. Management actions from wildlife, vegetation, and livestock management would maintain and enhance critical habitat and forage. Wildlife habitat objectives would be considered for all surface disturbing activities.  Impacts under this alternative would be the same as under Alternative 1.
<b>Wick Beumee Area</b>  The area would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area. There would be no impacts to the continued ability of the unit to serve its intended purpose from any BLM program activity.			Impacts under this alternative would be the same as under Alternative 1.
<b>Shirley Mountain Bat Cave Area</b>  The Shirley Mountain Caves SRMA would not be maintained. Alternative 1 would provide adequate protection to most wildlife resources in the area. However, because timber harvesting would be allowed in the watershed above the caves would alter the hydrology, the climatic and ecological conditions required for bat species within the cave system would not be protected.	The Shirley Mountain Caves SRMA, including the Cave Creek Cave, would not be maintained. Intensive management of timber harvesting within $\frac{1}{4}$ -mile of the cave complex would help maintain the hydrology that creates the climatic and ecological conditions required for bat species to maintain a viable population within the cave system.	The Shirley Mountain Caves SRMA would not be maintained, and the area would be managed as an ACEC (520 acres). Not allowing timber harvesting within $\frac{1}{2}$ -mile of the cave complex would maintain the hydrology that creates the climatic and ecological conditions required for bat species to maintain a viable population within the cave system.  Increasing the seasonal closure under this alternative would afford additional protection of the bat species.	The Shirley Mountain Caves SRMA would not be maintained, and the area would be managed as an ACEC (240 acres). Not allowing timber harvesting within $\frac{1}{4}$ -mile of the cave complex would maintain the hydrology that creates the climatic and ecological conditions required for bat species to maintain a viable population within the cave system.  Increasing the seasonal closure under this alternative would afford additional protection of the bat species.

SUMMARY COMPARISON OF IMPACTS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Preferred)
<b>Laramie Plains Lakes Area</b>  The area would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area. Pursuit of public land acquisitions could increase the potential for expansion of the Wyoming toad habitat. However, increased access associated with acquisitions could increase impacts from surface disturbing and other disruptive activities.	The area would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area. Public land acquisitions would not be pursued within the Laramie Plains Lakes Area, potentially limiting management opportunities for the benefit of Wyoming toad habitat.	The Laramie Plains Lakes area would be designated as an ACEC. Management actions from other resource programs would protect the potential habitat for the endangered Wyoming Toad.	The area would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area. Impacts would be similar to those under Alternative 1. However, limiting off-road vehicular use for necessary tasks and mineral entry activity would also help to maintain habitat for the endangered Wyoming toad.
<b>Historic Trails</b>  Surface disturbing activities could create visual intrusions and degrade the visual integrity and historic values of the trails. However, restrictions on such activities (e.g., avoidance within 1/4-mile, or the visual horizon, in contributing sections) would help to reduce impacts.	Impacts would be similar to those under Alternative 1, except increased mineral development and reduced restrictions on surface disturbing and other disruptive activities from other resource management would potentially result in collective impacts to the values that make the trails eligible for NRHP.	Surface disturbing activities could create visual intrusions on existing leases and degrade the visual integrity and historic values of the trails. However, restrictions on such activities (e.g., NSO within 1/4-mile, or the visual horizon, in contributing sections on existing leases) would reduce impacts.  Increase in VRM Class II areas (e.g., 5 miles from trail trace) would reduce related impacts. These measures would help protect both the physical and visual integrity of the trails.	Surface disturbing activities could create visual intrusions and degrade the visual integrity and historic values of the trails. However, restrictions on such activities (e.g., NSO within 1/4-mile, or the visual horizon, in contributing sections) would reduce impacts.  Increase in VRM Class II areas (e.g., 2 miles from trail trace in contributing sections) would reduce related impacts. These measures would help protect both the physical and visual integrity of the trails.

SUMMARY COMPARISON OF IMPACTS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Preferred)
<b>Blowout Penstemmon Area</b>	<p>Surface disturbing activities that occur in blowout penstemmon potential habitat would indirectly affect the future expansion of the population. Land tenure adjustments would be pursued to reduce the effects of surface disturbance associated with non-federal inholdings and thereby protect additional blowout penstemmon habitat areas. Intensive management of surface disturbing and other disruptive activities would prevent direct impacts to blowout penstemmon on BLM-administered lands.</p>	<p>Impacts under this alternative would be similar to those under Alternative 1, except land tenure adjustments would not be pursued, potentially limiting management opportunities for the benefit of blowout penstemmon habitat.</p>	<p>Impacts under this alternative would be similar to those under Alternative 1, except designating the area as an ACEC would promote additional protection for blowout penstemmon habitat through restrictions on surface disturbing and other disruptive activities. Although surface disturbing and other disruptive activities would still affect the future expansion of the population, the relevant and important values of the ACEC would be protected.</p>
<b>Upper Muddy Creek Watershed/Grizzly Area</b>	<p>The grizzly allotment portion of the Upper Muddy Creek Watershed would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area (26,850 acres).</p> <p>Management would not specifically address the conservation of Colorado River fish fauna and terrestrial wildlife species. There would be significant impacts to the area (e.g., such as reduction of fish habitat, sedimentation of creeks).</p>	<p>The area would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area (70,780 acres).</p> <p>Impacts under this alternative would be similar to those under Alternative 1, except the magnitude of development activities would be greater, and impacts would be proportionally larger.</p>	<p>The area would be designated as an ACEC (70,780 acres).</p> <p>Management would emphasize the conservation of Colorado River fish fauna and terrestrial wildlife species. Increased wildlife protection measures would result in proportionally fewer impacts.</p> <p>Prohibiting surface discharge of produced water would maintain hydrologic function for fish habitat</p>

SUMMARY COMPARISON OF IMPACTS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Preferred)
<b>White-Tailed Prairie Dog Area</b>  The area would not be designated as an ACEC.  Surface disturbing and other disruptive activities would be avoided near white-tailed prairie dog towns or complexes. Intensive management and continuation of existing management practices would meet the needs of the white-tailed prairie dog populations and protect the area by relocating activities outside of white-tailed prairie dog towns.	 The area would not be designated as an ACEC.  Not avoiding surface disturbance would degrade white-tailed prairie dog habitat. Increased predation and stress of white-tailed prairie dogs would occur.	 The area would be designated as an ACEC.  Surface disturbing and other disruptive activities would be prohibited within white-tailed prairie dog towns or complexes. Intensive management would meet the needs of the white-tailed prairie dog population's and protect the area by relocating activities outside of white-tailed prairie dog towns.	 The area would not be designated as an ACEC.  Impacts under this alternative would be the same as under Alternative 1.
<b>High Savy Dam Area</b>  The area would not be designated as an ACEC.  Management actions would result in protection of the dam and reservoir area, as per the MOU.	 The area would not be designated as an ACEC.  Impacts under this alternative would be the same as under Alternative 1.	 The area would be designated as an ACEC.  Management actions would provide an additional level of protection for the dam and reservoir area. Alternative 3 would provide protection of riparian habitat and would move the vegetation communities toward DPC, through intensive management of riparian habitat and proposed vegetation management and minerals management.	 The area would be designated as an ACEC.  Impacts under this alternative would be the same as under Alternative 3.

SUMMARY COMPARISON OF IMPACTS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Preferred)
<b>Continental Divide National Scenic Trail</b>  Based on the objectives for the SRMA, which encourages multiple use of lands adjacent to the trail, resource program management actions would not impact the SRMA.	Impacts under this alternative would be the same as under Alternative 1.	Impacts under this alternative would be similar to those under Alternative 1, except public lands 30 feet either side of the centerline along the trail would be closed to locatable mineral entry and land tenure adjustments. These actions would limit industrial development that would potentially reduce the quality of the recreational experience of some users of the trail.	Impacts under this alternative would be the same as under Alternative 3.
<b>North Platte River Area</b>  The area would be designated as an SRMA.  Lands and realty management actions to improve access to the river would help disperse usage and improve the recreational experience. Significant impacts from noxious and invasive weeds would occur, which would detract from the recreational experience along the river.	The area would not be designated as an SRMA.  Impacts under this alternative would be the same as under Alternative 1.	The area would be designated as an SRMA.  Visitor access would be limited to existing public access points along the river. Both a wider corridor on either side of the river and a VRM Class II designation would protect the recreational experience of the North Platte River SRMA. Noxious and invasive weeds management actions would improve the overall recreational experience.	The area would be designated as an SRMA.  Lands and realty management actions to improve access to the river would help disperse usage and improve the recreational experience. Noxious and invasive weeds management actions would improve the overall recreational experience.
<b>Rawlins Off-Highway Vehicle Area</b>  This area would not be managed as an SRMA.  OHV use would be constrained within the designated area, which would enhance public safety and minimize resource conflicts.	The area would be designated as an SRMA.  OHV use would not be constrained within the SRMA. Riders would have unrestricted use of the designated area. This would lead to potential threats to public safety, and resource conflicts.	The area would be designated as an SRMA.  OHV use would be limited to a designed recreational course, which would improve public safety, limit resource damage, and minimize conflicts between users.	The area would not be designated as an SRMA.  Impacts under this alternative would be the same as under Alternative 3.
<b>National Natural Landmarks</b>  There would be negligible impacts to the NNLs from any management action.	Impacts under this alternative would be the same as under Alternative 1.	Impacts under this alternative would be the same as under Alternative 1.	Impacts under this alternative would be the same as under Alternative 1.

SUMMARY COMPARISON OF IMPACTS				
	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Preferred)
<b>Encampment River (Wild and Scenic)</b>	<p>There would be a significant impact from the proliferation of invasive weed species, which would impact the outstandingly remarkable characteristics of the WSR. The area proposed for WSR designation falls entirely within the Encampment River WSA, which constrains the development of alternate interim management prescriptions.</p>	<p>Although the river would not be designated a WSR, values would be protected under the management of the Encampment River Canyon WSA unless Congress were to release the WSA from wilderness consideration.</p>	<p>This alternative would provide the most protection to the outstandingly remarkable characteristics of the proposed WSR, and significant impacts would not occur.</p>	<p>Although the level of protection would not be as great as that under Alternative 3, the outstandingly remarkable characteristics of the proposed WSR would be protected, and significant impacts would not occur.</p>
<b>Impacts on Transportation and Access</b>	<p>Restrictions on surface disturbing activities to protect sensitive resources would influence the placement of roadways and access during certain times of the year. However, substantial restrictions on public access and opportunities for access easement acquisitions and subsequent road development would not occur. Therefore, significant impacts to the transportation and access management program would not occur under this alternative.</p>	<p>Impacts under this alternative would be the same as under Alternative 1, except impacts would be the least extensive under this alternative because of less restrictive requirements for surface disturbing activities.</p>	<p>Impacts under this alternative would be the same as under Alternative 1, impacts would be the most extensive under this alternative because of more restrictive requirements for surface disturbing activities.</p>	<p>Impacts under this alternative would be the same as under Alternative 1, except impacts would be slightly greater because of more restrictive requirements for surface disturbing activities.</p>

SUMMARY COMPARISON OF IMPACTS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Preferred)
<b>Impacts on Vegetation</b>			
Surface disturbing activities would result in direct removal of vegetation resources. Loss of vegetation in general can affect the viability and uniqueness of vegetation communities and impair the ability of vegetation to support other resource values.	<p>Impacts under this alternative would be the same as under Alternative 1, except increased surface disturbance would increase related effects.</p> <p>This level of vegetation treatment, emphasizing landscape-scale projects, would increase the proportion of early- and mid-seral plant communities. This would result in vigorous, diverse, and productive plant communities.</p> <p>Treatments would, in the long term, control the introduction and proliferation of noxious and invasive weeds in the RMPPA.</p> <p>Occupied special status plant habitat would be protected; however, potential habitat for expansion of these species would not be protected and, therefore, opportunities for population increases would be reduced.</p> <p>The treatment of noxious and invasive weeds would not be sufficient to slow the proliferation of noxious and invasive weed species, further reducing the productivity of vegetation communities.</p> <p>No significant impacts to sensitive or special status plant species would likely occur.</p>	<p>Impacts under this alternative would be the same as under Alternative 1, except decreased surface disturbance would reduce related effects.</p> <p>This level of vegetation treatment, emphasizing smaller and more numerous projects combined with the use of fire for resource benefit, would help to increase the proportion of early- and mid-seral plant communities. This would improve the vigor, diversity, and productivity of plant communities.</p> <p>Treatments would keep pace with the establishment of new noxious and invasive weed populations and attempt to control the proliferation of noxious and invasive weeds over the long term.</p> <p>There would be no significant impacts to special status plants or their communities.</p>	<p>Impacts under this alternative would be the same as under Alternative 1, except decreased surface disturbance would slightly reduce related effects.</p> <p>This level of vegetation treatment, emphasizing landscape-scale projects combined with the use of fire for resource benefit, would increase the proportion of early- and mid-seral plant communities, which would result in vigorous, diverse, and productive plant communities.</p> <p>Treatments would keep pace with the establishment of new noxious and invasive weed populations and attempt to control the proliferation of noxious and invasive weeds over the long term.</p> <p>There would be no significant impacts to special status plants or their communities.</p>
<b>Impacts on Visual Resources</b>	Impacts would be the same as under Alternative 1.	Impacts would be the same as under Alternative 1.	Impacts would be the same as under Alternative 1.

SUMMARY COMPARISON OF IMPACTS				
	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Preferred)
<b>Impacts on Water Quality, Watershed, and Soils</b>	<p>The combined impact of surface disturbing activities would likely have impacts on water quality and watersheds in localized areas. BMPs for non-point source pollution (Appendix 13) would be applied to mitigate impacts.</p> <p>Produced water from minerals actions would be surface discharged and would likely have significant impacts on water quality and watersheds in the Colorado River Basin or in the North Platte River above Seminoe Reservoir.</p> <p>Surface disturbing activities would impact soil resources in localized areas, resulting in soil loss above natural levels.</p>	<p>Similar to Alternative 1, the combined impact of surface disturbing activities would likely have impacts on water quality and watersheds in localized areas. BMPs for non-point source pollution (Appendix 13) would be applied to mitigate impacts. Also, surface disturbing activities would impact soil resources in localized areas, resulting in soil loss above natural levels.</p>	<p>Similar to Alternative 1, the combined impact of surface disturbing activities would likely have impacts on water quality and watersheds in localized areas. BMPs for non-point source pollution (Appendix 13) would be applied to mitigate impacts. Also, surface disturbing activities would impact soil resources in localized areas, resulting in soil loss above natural levels.</p>	<p>Similar to Alternative 1, the combined impact of surface disturbing activities would likely have impacts on water quality and watersheds in localized areas. BMPs for non-point source pollution (Appendix 13) would be applied to mitigate impacts. Also, surface disturbing activities would impact soil resources in localized areas, resulting in soil loss above natural levels.</p>

SUMMARY COMPARISON OF IMPACTS				
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Preferred)	
<b>Impacts on Wild Horses</b>	<p>Wild horses would be temporarily displaced from preferred locations by human presence and activities. Habitat components, such as forage and water, would be stable or improve in quality and quantity.</p> <p>Genetic viability of wild horses in all HMAs would be maintained.</p> <p>Preservation of the New World Iberian genotype in the Lost Creek HMA would not be guaranteed.</p>	<p>Increased development would increase the short-term displacement of wild horses, leading to a greater loss in the wild and free-roaming nature than any other alternative.</p> <p>Habitat components, such as forage and water, would decrease.</p> <p>Similar to Alternative 1, genetic viability of wild horses in all HMAs would be maintained. Preservation of the New World Iberian genotype in the Lost Creek HMA would not be guaranteed.</p>	<p>Increased restrictions on surface disturbing and other disruptive activities would reduce human activity, thereby preserving the wild and free-roaming nature of wild horses.</p> <p>Habitat components, such as forage and water, would increase and improve in quality and quantity.</p> <p>Similar to Alternative 1, genetic viability of wild horses in all HMAs would be maintained. Preservation of the genetically significant New World Iberian genotype in the Lost Creek HMA would be ensured.</p>	<p>Increased protection would decrease human presence in HMAs related to surface disturbing and other disruptive activities and preserve the wild and free-roaming nature of wild horses.</p> <p>Similar to Alternative 1, genetic viability of wild horses in all HMAs would be maintained. Preservation of the New World Iberian genotype in the Lost Creek HMA would not be guaranteed. Also, habitat components, such as forage and water, would decrease.</p>

SUMMARY COMPARISON OF IMPACTS				
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Preferred)	
<b>Impacts on Wildlife and Fish</b>	<p>Impacts would result from minerals management year round, and particularly in seasonally sensitive wildlife habitats. Minerals development would continue to impact wildlife and fish through loss, alteration, and fragmentation of habitats and displacement of wildlife. An increased number of roads, pipelines, and infrastructure for surface water disposal would increase habitat loss, fragmentation, and changes in surface hydrology. Vegetation treatments would not be adequate to achieve wildlife habitat goals. The combined impacts from these actions would lead to significant impacts in localized areas.</p> <p>Additional impacts could result from livestock management, minerals development, OHV activities, wild horse use, vegetation management, road crossings, impoundments, and instream structures.</p>	<p>Under Alternative 2, more surface disturbance is estimated to occur. Impacts would result from yearlong drilling. Minerals development would continue to impact wildlife and fish through loss, alteration, and fragmentation of habitats and displacement of wildlife. An increased number of roads, pipelines, and infrastructure for surface water disposal would increase habitat loss, fragmentation, and changes in surface hydrology. The combined impacts from these actions would lead to significant impacts in localized areas, and would be more likely under this alternative.</p> <p>Additional impacts would result from livestock management, minerals development, OHV activities, wild horse use, SMA, vegetation management, road crossings, impoundments, and instream structures.</p>	<p>The greatest amount of protection for wildlife and fish species, associated habitats, and sensitive life cycles would be provided under this alternative from SMA designations and other protective measures.</p> <p>Additional impacts would result from management of vegetation, livestock, mineral, OHV use, wild horses, and fire and fuels management.</p>	<p>Conservation measures and BMPs designed to reduce surface disturbing and other disruptive activities in sensitive habitats during critical times of the year would be used to minimize impacts.</p> <p>Vegetation management in wetland/riparian areas to meet DPC would result in significant, long-term benefits to wildlife, especially big game.</p> <p>Additional impacts would result from livestock management, minerals management, OHV activities, and wild horse use. Increased numbers of SMAs would benefit wildlife. In addition, fire and fuels management would displace wildlife but provide natural disturbance regimes to maintain diversity.</p>

**Table 2-5. Utility/Transportation Systems and Wind Energy Avoidance Areas**

Avoidance Areas	Acres <sup>1</sup>			
	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
WSAs (VRM I)	67,730	67,730	67,730	67,730
Steep slopes greater than 25%	210,410	210,410	210,410	210,410
Identified 100-year floodplains; 500 feet from perennial surface waters, wells, springs and wetland/riparian areas; 100 feet from the inner gorge of ephemeral channels <sup>2</sup>	60,430	60,430	60,430	60,430
Greater-Sage and Sharp-Tailed Grouse Leks (1/4 Mile)	46,360	46,360	46,360	46,360
VRM class II	359,610	233,930	941,820	590,430
Como Bluffs ACEC/National Natural Landmark	1,690	1,690	1,690	1,690
Sand Hills/JO Ranch Expansion ACEC	7,960	7,960	12,700	12,700
Jep Canyon ACEC/WHMA	13,810	13,810	13,810	13,810
Shamrock Hills ACEC/WHMA	18,400	18,400	18,400	18,400
Blowout Penstemon SMA/ACEC	90	90	4,020	4,020
Shirley Mountain Bat Cave SMA/ACEC	NA	240	520	240
Shirley Mountain Caves SRMA	24,440	NA	NA	NA
Chain Lakes SMA/ACEC	NA	NA	30,520	NA
Red Rim-Daley SMA/ACEC	NA	NA	15,980	NA
Laramie Peak SMA/ACEC	NA	NA	18,940	NA
Upper Muddy Creek Watershed/Grizzly SMA/ACEC	NA	NA	70,780	70,780
Pennock Mountain SMA/ACEC	NA	NA	7,770	7,770
Laramie Plains Lakes SMA/ACEC	NA	NA	1,600	1,600
Wick-Beumee WHMA	280	NA	280	NA
High Savery Dam SMA/ACEC	530	530	530	530
Stratton Sagebrush Steppe Research Area SMA/ACEC	5,530	5,530	5,530	5,530
Hogback Lake OHV SRMA	480	480	480	480
White-Tailed Prairie Dogs SMA/ACEC <sup>3</sup>	NA	NA	ND	NA
NRHP Contributing Portions of Historic Trails	41,000	41,000	66,260	41,000
Existing and proposed recreation sites	9,660	9,660	24,310	16,090
Special Status Plant Species Areas and Unique Plant Communities <sup>4</sup>	ND	ND	ND	ND

Notes:

<sup>1</sup> Alternatives 1, 2, and 4 indicate acres, with important resource values, that would be avoided for new facility placement.

Alternative 3 indicates acres with important resource values that would be closed to new facility placement, including routes.

<sup>2</sup> Acreage only reflects 500 feet from perennial surface waters, wells, springs, and wetland/riparian areas.<sup>3</sup> Not shown on map; covers 59, 261 acres of RMPPA.<sup>4</sup> Those avoidance areas not calculated and acres not mapped would be assessed on a case-by-case basis.

NA Not applicable to the alternative

ND Could not be determined at this time

**Table 2-6. Areas of Fluid Mineral Lease Conditional Requirements by Hydrocarbon Potential (Approximate Federal Subsurface Acres)<sup>1</sup>**

Area	Hydrocarbon Potential (Federal subsurface acres)			Total	
	High	Moderate	Low		
<b>ALTERNATIVE 1:</b>					
<b>NO LEASE<sup>2</sup></b>					
WSAs	0	27,050	37,100	64,150	
Encampment River Wild and Scenic River	0	0	620	620	
<b>Total Affected Area (in acres)<sup>5</sup></b>	<b>0</b>	<b>27,050</b>	<b>37,100</b>	<b>64,150</b>	
<b>NO SURFACE OCCUPANCY<sup>3,4</sup></b>					
High Savery Dam and Reservoir area	0	0	1,050	1,050	
Active raptor nest areas	15,900	37,040	45,350	98,290	
Stratton Sagebrush Steppe Research Area	0	0	0	0	
JO Ranch Site	1	0	0	1	
Cemeteries	0	0	120	120	
Black footed ferret	N/D	N/D	N/D	N/D	
Towns + 1/4 mile	480	40	150	670	
Campgrounds and recreation sites	0	540	9,430	9,970	
Identified or known Preble's meadow jumping mouse hibernation habitat	0	0	1,340	1,340	
<b>Total Affected Area (in acres)<sup>5</sup></b>	<b>16,290</b>	<b>37,480</b>	<b>55,900</b>	<b>109,660</b>	
<b>CONTROLLED SURFACE USE<sup>3,4</sup></b>					
Chain Lakes ACEC (Delineated Wetlands)	0	1,320	2,350	3,670	
Jep Canyon – aspen vegetation	20	80	1,420	1,520	
Blowout penstemon habitat	0	0	90	90	
Shirley Mountain SRMA/Bat Caves			11,270	11,270	
Non-trail cultural eligible properties + 1/4 mile	0	130	110	240	
North Platte River SRMA + 1/4 mile either side of the river	0	100	5,240	5,340	
Rawlins OHV Area	480	0	0	480	
Perennial waters, Wetland/Riparian Areas + 500 feet	5,460	3,880	57,650	66,990	
Historic Trails + 1/4 mile	5,080	15,670	14,810	35,560	
Black-tailed prairie dog complexes	N/D	N/D	N/D	N/D	
White-tailed prairie dog complexes	N/D	N/D	N/D	N/D	
Ute ladies' tresses <sup>6</sup>	N/D	N/D	N/D	N/D	
Greater and sharp-tailed sage-grouse leks + 1/4 mile	8,050	5,930	18,010	31,990	
Western boreal toad <sup>6</sup>	N/D	N/D	N/D	N/D	
Wyoming toad	0	0	0	0	
Yellow-billed cuckoo <sup>6</sup>	N/D	N/D	N/D	N/D	
VRM Class II	11,800	17,870	483,980	513,650	
<b>Total Affected Area (in acres)<sup>5</sup></b>	<b>29,530</b>	<b>43,310</b>	<b>535,960</b>	<b>608,800</b>	
<b>SEASONAL LIMITATIONS<sup>3,4</sup></b>					
Big game parturition areas	0	0	16,690	16,690	

Area	Hydrocarbon Potential (Federal subsurface acres)			Total
	High	Moderate	Low	
Bald eagle communal winter roost sites <sup>7</sup>	0	0	10	10
Bald eagle nesting habitat + 1 mile	0	600	3,680	4,280
Big game crucial winter range	100,180	208,390	538,540	847,110
Golden eagle, bald eagle, and ferruginous hawk nesting habitat + 1 mile	60,940	152,480	174,070	387,490
Raptor nests + $\frac{3}{4}$ mile	55,300	146,120	133,310	334,730
Greater sage-grouse nesting habitat + 2 miles	221,650	211,020	553,900	986,570
East of Highway 789: Greater sage-grouse leks + 2 miles	146,000	46,490	31,480	223,970
Sharp-tailed grouse nesting habitat + 1 mile	5,350	3,630	3,950	12,930
East of Highway 789: Sharp-tailed grouse leks + 1 mile	5,350	3,630	3,940	12,920
Greater sage-grouse winter habitat	90	270	0	360
Mountain plover habitat	89,790	166,680	372,750	629,220
<b>Total Affected Area (in acres)<sup>5</sup></b>	<b>323,730</b>	<b>543,190</b>	<b>1,184,400</b>	<b>2,051,320</b>
<b>ALTERNATIVE 2:</b>				
<b>NO LEASE<sup>2</sup></b>				
WSAs	0	27,050	37,100	64,150
Rawlins OHV SRMA (new leases)	0	0	0	0
Encampment River Wild and Scenic River	0	0	610	610
<b>Total Affected Area (in acres)<sup>5</sup></b>	<b>0</b>	<b>27,050</b>	<b>37,100</b>	<b>64,150</b>
<b>NO SURFACE OCCUPANCY<sup>3,4</sup></b>				
High Savery Dam and Reservoir area	0	0	1,050	1,050
JO Ranch Site	1	0	0	1
Cemeteries	0	0	120	120
Black footed ferret	N/D	N/D	N/D	N/D
Identified or known Preble's meadow jumping mouse breeding habitat	0	0	1,340	1,340
Towns + $\frac{1}{4}$ mile	480	40	150	670
Campgrounds and recreation sites (1/4 Mile Buffer)	0	540	9,430	9,970
Gibben's Beard Tongue	0	20	0	20
<b>Total Affected Area (in acres)<sup>5</sup></b>	<b>480</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>12,040</b>	<b>13,120</b>
<b>CONTROLLED SURFACE USE<sup>3,4</sup></b>				
Non-tail cultural eligible properties + $\frac{1}{4}$ mile radius	0	130	110	240
Historic Trails + $\frac{1}{4}$ mile	5,340	16,380	14,850	36,570
Stratton Sagebrush Steppe Research Management Area	0	0	0	0
Blowout penstemon area	0	0	90	90
Shirley Mountain Bat Cave area	0	0	240	240
Rawlins OHV SRMA (existing leases)	480	0	0	480
Perennial waters, Wetland/Riparian Areas + 500 feet	5,810	4,140	62,560	72,510
Black-tailed prairie dog complexes	N/D	N/D	N/D	N/D
White-tailed prairie dog complexes	N/D	N/D	N/D	N/D
Preble's meadow jumping mouse <sup>6</sup>	N/D	N/D	N/D	N/D

Area	Hydrocarbon Potential (Federal subsurface acres)			Total
	High	Moderate	Low	
Ute ladies' tresses <sup>6</sup>	N/D	N/D	N/D	N/D
Western boreal toad <sup>6</sup>	N/D	N/D	N/D	N/D
Wyoming toad	0	0	0	0
Yellow-billed cuckoo <sup>6</sup>	N/D	N/D	N/D	N/D
VRM Class II	0	1,400	328,520	329,920
<b>Total Affected Area (in acres)<sup>5</sup></b>	<b>10,840</b>	<b>21,110</b>	<b>369,820</b>	<b>401,770</b>
<b>SEASONAL LIMITATIONS<sup>3,4</sup></b>				
Bald eagle communal winter roost sites	0	0	10	10
Bald eagle nesting habitat + ½ mile	0	80	710	790
Raptor nests + ½ mile	72,570	167,960	192,410	432,940
Mountain plover habitat	89,790	166,680	372,750	629,220
<b>Total Affected Area (in acres)<sup>5</sup></b>	<b>141,880</b>	<b>294,980</b>	<b>496,780</b>	<b>933,640</b>
<b>ALTERNATIVE 3:</b>				
<b>NO LEASE<sup>2</sup></b>				
WSAs	0	27,050	37,100	64,150
West end of Ferris Mountains	0	0	2,960	2,960
Adobe Town fringe areas	0	26,540	3,490	30,030
North Platte River SRMA + ½ mile either side of the river	0	340	14,490	14,830
Wick-Beumee Wildlife Habitat Management Area	0	0	1,930	1,930
Stratton Sagebrush Steppe Research Area ACEC	0	0	0	0
Chain Lakes ACEC (New Leases)	0	3,120	630	3,750
Jep Canyon Wildlife Habitat Management Area	80	0	200	280
Laramie Plains Lakes ACEC (New Leases)	0	0	0	0
Shirley Mountain Bat Cave ACEC	0	0	520	520
Rawlins OHV SRMA (New Leases)	0	0	0	0
Encampment River Wild and Scenic River	0	0	620	620
Sand Hills ACEC and JO Ranch Expansion (New leases)	2,440	10	80	2,530
Raptor concentration areas (RCAs)	6,530	13,590	15,950	36,070
<b>Total Affected Area (in acres)<sup>5</sup></b>	<b>9,010</b>	<b>70,530</b>	<b>77,220</b>	<b>156,760</b>
<b>NO SURFACE OCCUPANCY<sup>3,4</sup></b>				
High Savery Dam ACEC	0	0	1,050	1,050
Non-tail cultural eligible properties + ¼ mile radius	0	130	110	240
Greater and sharp-tailed sage-grouse leks + ¼ mile	8,050	5,930	18,010	31,990
Active raptor nest areas (1320 ft.)	23,830	58,220	65,710	147,760
Bald Eagle Nesting Area (1/2 Mile)	0	80	710	790
Big game parturition areas	0	0	16,690	16,690
Upper Muddy Creek/Grizzly (New Leases - Located 1/4 mile from Perennial Streams)	140	40	10	190
JO Ranch Site	1	0	0	1
Como Bluff ACEC (new leases)	0	0	0	0
Blowout Penstemon ACEC	0	0	5,070	5,070

Area	Hydrocarbon Potential (Federal subsurface acres)			Total
	High	Moderate	Low	
Identified or known Preble's meadow jumping mouse breeding habitat	0	0	1,340	1,340
Cemeteries	0	0	120	120
Towns + ¼ mile	480	40	150	670
Campgrounds and recreation sites + ½ mile	0	1,200	14,880	16,080
Perennial waters, Wetland/Riparian Areas + 500 feet	5,810	4,140	62,560	72,510
Black footed ferret	N/D	N/D	N/D	N/D
Historic Trails + ¼ mile (new leases)	860	700	13,880	15,440
Gibben's beardtongue	0	20	0	20
<b>Total Affected Area (in acres)<sup>5</sup></b>	<b>34,710</b>	<b>62,560</b>	<b>171,250</b>	<b>268,520</b>
<b>CONTROLLED SURFACE USE<sup>3,4</sup></b>				
Upper Muddy Creek Watershed/Grizzly ACEC (Existing Leases - Located ¼ Mile from Perennial Water)	10,050	14,590	11,000	35,640
Sand Hills ACEC and JO Ranch Expansion (existing leases)	7,690	980	0	8,670
Jep Canyon Wildlife Habitat Management Area (existing leases)	5,120	4,760	2,380	12,260
Chain Lakes ACEC (existing leases)	0	8,920	14,980	23,900
Stratton Sagebrush Steppe Research Area ACEC (existing leases)	0	0	0	0
Rawlins OHV SRMA (existing leases)	480	0	0	480
Historic Trails + ¼ mile (existing leases)	10,770	16,590	11,460	38,820
Black-tailed prairie dog complexes	N/D	N/D	N/D	N/D
White-tailed prairie dog complexes	N/D	N/D	N/D	N/D
Ute ladies' tresses <sup>6</sup>	N/D	N/D	N/D	N/D
Western boreal toad <sup>6</sup>	N/D	N/D	N/D	N/D
Wyoming toad	0	0	0	0
Yellow-billed cuckoo <sup>6</sup>	N/D	N/D	N/D	N/D
VRM Class II	107,650	207,160	546,850	947,330
<b>Total Affected Area (in acres)<sup>5</sup></b>	<b>114,540</b>	<b>226,550</b>	<b>571,190</b>	<b>912,280</b>
<b>SEASONAL LIMITATIONS<sup>3,4</sup></b>				
Bald eagle communal winter roost sites	0	0	10	10
Bald eagle nesting habitat + 1 ½ miles	0	1,750	8,500	10,260
Bald eagle communal roosting + 2 miles	0	3,370	14,840	18,210
Raptor nests + 1 ½ miles	276,030	546,480	690,610	1,513,120
Greater sage-grouse nesting habitat + 2 miles	221,650	211,020	553,900	986,570
East of Highway 789: Greater sage-grouse leks + 4 miles	178,290	83,590	71,200	333,080
Sharp-tailed grouse nesting habitat + 1 mile	5,350	3,630	3,950	12,930
East of Highway 789: Sharp-tailed grouse leks + 2 miles	14,540	7,750	10,100	32,390
Mountain plover habitat	89,790	166,680	372,750	629,220
Big game crucial winter range	100,180	208,380	538,540	847,100
<b>Total Affected Area (in acres)<sup>5</sup></b>	<b>357,900</b>	<b>681,080</b>	<b>1,337,201</b>	<b>2,376,170</b>

Area	Hydrocarbon Potential (Federal subsurface acres)			Total	
	High	Moderate	Low		
<b>ALTERNATIVE 4:</b>					
<b>NO LEASE<sup>2</sup></b>					
WSAs	0	27,050	37,100	64,150	
West end of Ferris Mountains	0	0	2,960	2,960	
Stratton Sagebrush Steppe Research Management Area (new leases)	0	0	0	0	
Encampment River Wild and Scenic River	0	0	620	620	
<b>Total Affected Area (in acres)<sup>5</sup></b>	<b>0</b>	<b>27,050</b>	<b>40,040</b>	<b>67,090</b>	
<b>NO SURFACE OCCUPANCY<sup>3,4</sup></b>					
High Savery Dam and Reservoir area	0	0	1,050	1,050	
Greater and sharp-tailed sage-grouse leks + ¼ mile	8,050	5,930	18,010	31,990	
Active raptor nest areas (825 ft. to 1200 ft.)	15,900	37,040	45,350	98,290	
JO Ranch Site	1	0	0	1	
Blowout Penstemon ACEC	0	0	5,070	5,070	
Gibben's beardtongue	0	20	0	20	
Cemeteries	0	0	120	120	
Non-tail cultural eligible properties + ¼ mile radius	0	130	110	240	
Towns + ¼ mile	480	40	150	670	
Bald Eagle + ½ Mile	0	80	710	790	
Identified or known Preble's meadow jumping mouse hibernation habitat	0	0	1,340	1,340	
Campgrounds and recreation sites + ¼ mile	0	540	9,430	9,970	
Black footed ferret	N/D	N/D	N/D	N/D	
Historic Trails + ¼ mile (New Leases)	140	700	11,470	12,310	
<b>Total Affected Area (in acres)<sup>5</sup></b>	<b>24,160</b>	<b>44,110</b>	<b>90,470</b>	<b>158,740</b>	
<b>CONTROLLED SURFACE USE<sup>3,4</sup></b>					
Stratton Sagebrush Steppe Research Management Area (existing leases)	0	0	0	0	
Shirley Mountain Bat Cave ACEC	0	0	240	240	
Sand Hills ACEC and JO Ranch Expansion	10,140	980	80	11,200	
North Platte River area + ¼ mile either side of the river	0	100	6,040	6,140	
Como Bluff NNL (within ¼ mile of exposures of the Morrison Formation)	0	0	0	0	
Rawlins OHV SRMA (existing leases)	480	0	0	480	
Perennial waters, Wetland/Riparian Areas + 500 feet	5,810	4,140	62,560	72,510	
Historic Trails + ¼ mile (Existing Leases)	5,200	15,680	3,380	24,260	
Black-tailed prairie dog complexes	N/D	N/D	N/D	N/D	
White-tailed prairie dog complexes	N/D	N/D	N/D	N/D	
Ute ladies' tresses <sup>6</sup>	N/D	N/D	N/D	N/D	
Western boreal toad <sup>6</sup>	N/D	N/D	N/D	N/D	
Wyoming toad	0	0	0	0	
Yellow-billed cuckoo <sup>6</sup>	N/D	N/D	N/D	N/D	

Area	Hydrocarbon Potential (Federal subsurface acres)			Total
	High	Moderate	Low	
VRM Class II	33,580	132,150	443,140	608,870
<b>Total Affected Area (in acres)<sup>5</sup></b>	<b>45,140</b>	<b>127,100</b>	<b>480,800</b>	<b>653,040</b>
<b>SEASONAL LIMITATIONS<sup>3,4</sup></b>				
Big game parturition areas	0	0	16,690	16,690
Big game crucial winter range	100,180	208,390	538,540	847,110
Bald eagle communal winter roost sites	0	0	10	10
Bald eagle nesting habitat + 1 mile	0	600	3,680	4,280
Bald eagle communal roosting + 2 miles	0	3,370	14,840	18,210
Raptor nests + ¾ mile to 1 mile	86,450	208,510	225,860	520,820
Greater sage-grouse nesting habitat + 2 miles	221,650	211,020	553,900	986,570
East of Highway 789: Greater sage-grouse leks + 2 miles	146,000	46,490	31,480	223,970
Sharp-tailed grouse nesting habitat + 1 mile	5,350	3,630	3,950	12,930
East of Highway 789: Sharp-tailed grouse leks + 1 mile	5,350	3,630	3,940	12,920
Mountain plover habitat	89,790	166,680	372,750	629,220
<b>Total Affected Area (in acres)<sup>5</sup></b>	<b>323,710</b>	<b>543,070</b>	<b>1,184,720</b>	<b>2,051,500</b>

<sup>1</sup>Lease parcels are designed on aliquot parts. The actual acreage for the lease may vary.

<sup>2</sup>Although closed to leasing and related oil and gas activity, any other surface disturbing or disrupting use would follow the surface disturbance prescriptions.

<sup>3</sup>All activities would be subject to intensive mitigation including offsite placement of facilities, remote control monitoring, restricted or prohibited surface use including road construction, multiple wells from a single pad, central tank batteries/facilities, pipelines and power lines concentrated in specific areas, etc. based on site-specific analysis.

<sup>4</sup>Refer to Appendix 1 (Wyoming Standard Mitigation Guidelines). These requirements apply to all surface disturbing activities.

<sup>5</sup>Acres may not add due to overlap of land resources and land restrictions.

<sup>6</sup>Habitat is protected by riparian stipulations.

<sup>7</sup>10 acres assumed for each nesting roost.

**Table 2-7. Summary of Proposed Special Management Area Designations by Alternatives**

Special Management Area	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
Como Bluff ACEC	ACEC/NNL (1,690 acres)	NNL (1,690 acres)	ACEC/NNL (1,690 acres)	NNL (1,690 acres)
Sand Hills ACEC and Potential JO Ranch Expansion	ACEC (7,960 acres)	WHMA (7,960 acres)	ACEC (12,700 acres)	ACEC (7,960 acres)
Jep Canyon ACEC/ Jep Canyon Wildlife HMA	ACEC (13,810 acres)	WHMA (13,810 acres)	WHMA (13,810 acres)	WHMA (13,810 acres)
Shamrock Hills ACEC	ACEC (18,400 acres)	WHMA (18,400 acres)	RCA (18,400 acres)	RCA (18,400 acres)
Stratton-Steppe Sagebrush Research Area (potential ACEC)	Research Management Area (5,530 acres)	Research Management Area (5,530 acres)	ACEC (5,530 acres)	Research Management Area (5,530 acres)
Chain Lakes (potential ACEC)	WHMA (30,470 acres)	WHMA (30,470 acres)	ACEC (30,470 acres)	WHMA (30,470 acres)
Laramie Peak (potential ACEC)	WHMA (18,940 acres)	WHMA (18,940 acres)	ACEC (18,940 acres)	WHMA (18,940 acres)
Red Rim-Daley (potential ACEC)	WHMA (15,980 acres)	WHMA (15,980 acres)	ACEC (15,980 acres)	WHMA (15,980 acres)
Pennock Mountain Wildlife HMA	WHMA (7,770 acres)	WHMA (7,770 acres)	WHMA (7,770 acres)	WHMA (7,770 acres)
Wick-Beumee Wildlife HMA	WHMA (280 acres)	WHMA (280 acres)	WHMA (280 acres)	WHMA (280 acres)
Shirley Mountain Caves/ Bat Cave potential ACEC	SRMA (24,400 acres)	No special designation.	ACEC (Bat Caves Area) (520 acres)	ACEC (Bat Caves Area) (240 acres)
Laramie Plains Lakes (potential ACEC)	WHMA (1,600 acres)	WHMA (1,600 acres)	ACEC (1,600 acres)	WHMA (1,600 acres)
Historic Trials (potential ACEC)	No special designation.	No special designation.	ACEC (41,000 acres)	No special designation.
Blowout Penstemon (potential ACEC)	No special designation.	No special designation.	ACEC and Endangered Plant Habitat Area (4,020 acres)	ACEC and Endangered Plant Habitat Area (4,020 acres)
Upper Muddy Creek Watershed Grizzly (potential ACEC)	WHMA (allotment only) (26,850 acres)	WHMA (70,780 acres)	ACEC (70,780 acres)	WHMA (70,780 acres)

Special Management Area	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
White-tailed Prairie Dog (potential ACEC)	No special designation.	No special designation.	ACEC (acreage not available)	No special designation.
High Savery Dam (potential ACEC)	No special designation.	No special designation.	ACEC (520 acres)	No special designation.
Continental Divide National Scenic Trail SRMA	SRMA (600 acres)	SRMA (600 acres)	SRMA (600 acres)	SRMA (600 acres)
North Platte River SRMA	SRMA (5,060 acres)	No special designation.	SRMA (5,060 acres)	SRMA (5,060 acres)
Rawlins OHV SRMA	No special designation.	SRMA (480 acres)	SRMA (480 acres)	No special designation.
National Natural Landmarks	Retain all NNLs (640 combined acres)			
Encampment River WSR	Propose as WSR (wild)	No special designation.	Propose as WSR (wild)	Propose as WSR (wild)
Ferris Mountains VSA	WSA (21,880 acres)	WSA (21,880 acres)	WSA (21,880 acres)	WSA (21,880 acres)
Adobe Town WSA	WSA (34,220 acres)	WSA (34,220 acres)	WSA (34,220 acres)	WSA (34,220 acres)
Prospect Mountain WSA	WSA (1,150 acres)	WSA (1,150 acres)	WSA (1,150 acres)	WSA (1,150 acres)
Encampment River Canyon WSA	WSA (4,510 acres)	WSA (4,510 acres)	WSA (4,510 acres)	WSA (4,510 acres)
Bennett Mountains WSA	WSA (5,960 acres)	WSA (5,960 acres)	WSA (5,960 acres)	WSA (5,960 acres)

**Table 2-8. Areas of Priority Access for Easement Acquisition**

<b>Areas of Importance<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Alternative 1</b>	<b>Alternative 2</b>	<b>Alternative 3</b>	<b>Alternative 4</b>
<b>Areas of High Importance</b>				
Arlington (forestry)	X	NA	X	X
Atlantic Rim (recreation)	X	NA	X	X
Big Creek (recreation)	X	NA	X	X
Ferris Mountains (recreation)	X	NA	X	X
Little Medicine (forestry)	X	NA	X	X
Miller Hill (recreation)	X	NA	X	X
Shirley Mountain (forestry and recreation)	X	NA	X	X
Seminole-Pathfinder (recreation)	NA	NA	X	X
Continental Divide National Scenic Trail (recreation)	NA	NA	X	X
Rawlins Uplift (recreation)	NA	NA	X	X
<b>Areas of Moderate Importance</b>				
North Laramie River (forestry)	X	NA	X	X
Pine Mountain-Split Rock (forestry)	X	NA	X	X
Rawlins Uplift (recreation)	X	NA	NA	NA
Seminole-Pathfinder (recreation)	X	NA	NA	NA
Toltec (forestry)	X	NA	X	X
White Rock Canyon (forestry)	X	NA	X	X
<b>Areas of Low Importance</b>				
Seven Mile (forestry)	X	NA	X	X
Sugarloaf (forestry)	X	NA	X	X
Woodedge (forestry)	X	NA	X	X
High Savery Dam and Reservoir Project (recreation)	NA	NA	X	X

Notes:

<sup>1</sup> Alternatives 1, 3, and 4 indicate areas for opportunities to acquire or maintain legal access as listed by alternative above. Alternative 2 would pursue opportunities only as they arise; therefore, this row is not applicable.

NA Not applicable.

**Table 2-9. Visual Resource Management Classifications and Acreage**

VRM Classification	Acreage	Percentage of Total Land Area
<b>Alternative 1 (Map 2-51)</b>		
I	67,630	1.9
II	359,610	10.1
III	2,677,480	75.4
IV	446,760	12.6
<b>Alternative 2 (Map 2-52)</b>		
I	67,630	1.9
II	233,950	6.6
III	2,578,990	72.6
IV	670,910	18.9
<b>Alternative 3 (Map 2-49)</b>		
I	67,630	1.9
II	941,810	26.5
III	1,967,960	55.4
IV	574,080	16.2
<b>Alternative 4 (Map 2-50)</b>		
I	67,630	1.9
II	589,530	16.6
III	2,275,180	64.1
IV	619,140	17.4
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3,551,480</b>	<b>100</b>

Source: BLM 2004.

Note: All lands in the RMPPA were rated; however, only the BLM-administered lands are managed within the VRM system, and only BLM lands are included in the above-referenced acreages.

**Table 2-10. Seasonal Wildlife Stipulations for all Surface Disturbing Activities**

Affected Areas	Restriction	Restricted Area
<b>Alternative 1</b>		
Big Game Crucial Winter Ranges	November 15–April 30	Antelope, elk, moose, and mule deer crucial winter ranges
Parturition Areas	May 1–June 30	Identified parturition areas
Greater sage-grouse and Columbian Sharp Tailed grouse Nesting Habitat	March 1–June 30	Within 2 miles of Greater sage-grouse lek and 1-mile radius of Columbian sharp-tailed grouse lek
Greater sage-grouse leks and Columbian Sharp Tailed grouse	March 1–June 30	East of State Highway 789, south of Interstate 80, west of State Highway 71 and Carbon County Road 401, and north of State Highway 70. Within 2 miles of Greater sage-grouse lek and 1-mile radius of Columbian sharp-tailed grouse lek
Greater sage-grouse and Columbian Sharp Tailed grouse Winter Concentration areas.	November 15–April 30	Within identified winter habitat
Mountain Plover	April 10–July 10	Occupied habitat
Yellow billed Cuckoo	April 15–August 15	Within ½ mile radius
Bald Eagle Nest	February 1–July 31	Within 1 mile radius
Bald Eagle Communal Roost	Year round	½ mile of communal roost sites
Golden Eagle Nest	February 1–July 31	Within 1 mile radius
Osprey Nest	February 1–July 31	Within ¾ mile radius
Swainson's Hawk Nest	February 1–July 31	Within ¾ mile radius
Ferruginous Hawk Nest	February 1–July 31	Within 1 mile radius
Goshawk Nest	February 1–July 31	Within ¾ mile radius
Prairie Falcon Nest	February 1–July 31	Within ¾ mile radius
Northern Harrier Nest	February 1–July 31	Within ¾ mile radius
Great Horned Owl Nest	February 1–July 31	Within ¾ mile radius
Red-tailed Hawk Nest	February 1–July 31	Within ¾ mile radius
Burrowing Owl	February 1–July 31	Within ¾ mile radius
Active Raptor Nests	Year round	Within 825 feet (ferruginous hawks, 1,200 feet)
Other Raptors	February 1–July 31	Within ¾ mile radius
<b>Alternative 2</b>		
Big Game Crucial Winter Ranges	None	None
Parturition Areas	None	None
Greater sage-grouse and Columbian Sharp Tailed grouse Nesting Habitat	None	None
Greater sage-grouse leks and Columbian Sharp Tailed grouse	None	None

Affected Areas	Restriction	Restricted Area
Greater sage-grouse and Columbian Sharp Tailed grouse Winter Concentration areas.	None	None
Mountain Plover	April 10–July 10	Occupied habitat
Yellow billed Cuckoo	April 15–August 15	Within ½ mile radius
Bald Eagle Nest	February 1–July 15	Within 1 mile radius
Bald Eagle Communal Roost	Year round	½ mile of communal roost sites
Golden Eagle Nest	February 1–July 15	Within ½ mile radius
Osprey Nest	April 1–July 31	Within ½ mile radius
Swainson's Hawk Nest	April 1–July 31	Within ½ mile radius
Ferruginous Hawk Nest	March 1–July 31	Within ½ mile radius
Goshawk Nest	April 1–August 31	Within ½ mile radius
Prairie Falcon Nest	April 1–July 31	Within ½ mile radius
Northern Harrier Nest	April 1–July 31	Within ½ mile radius
Great Horned Owl Nest	February 1–July 15	Within ½ mile radius
Red-tailed Hawk Nest	February 1–July 15	Within ½ mile radius
Burrowing Owl	April 15–September 15	Within ½ mile radius
Active Raptor Nests	Year round	None
Other Raptors	February 1–July 15	Within ¾ mile radius
<b>Alternative 3</b>		
Big Game Crucial Winter Ranges	November 15–April 30	Antelope, elk, moose and mule deer crucial winter ranges
Parturition Areas	Prohibited year round	Identified parturition areas
Greater sage-grouse and Columbian Sharp Tailed grouse Nesting Habitat	(1) March 1–May 20 Prohibit surface disturbance/occupancy Avoid human activity 6:00 p.m.–9:00 a.m.  (2) Within nesting/early brood rearing habitat March 15–July 15	(1) Within ¼ mile of occupied Greater sage-grouse and Columbian sharp tailed grouse nesting habitat  (2) Within 2-mile radius for Greater sage-grouse and within 1-mile radius for Columbian sharp-tailed grouse identified early brood rearing habitat.
Greater sage-grouse leks and Columbian Sharp Tailed grouse	March 1–May 20 Avoid human activity between 6:00 p.m.–9:00 a.m.	Prohibit surface disturbance/occupancy ¼ mile of perimeter of occupied Greater sage-grouse and Columbian sharp tailed-grouse. East of State Highway 789, south of Interstate 80, west of State Highway 71 and Carbon County Road 401, and north of State Highway 70.
Greater sage-grouse and Columbian Sharp Tailed grouse Winter Concentration areas.	November 15–March 14	Within identified winter habitat
Mountain Plover	April 10–July 10	Occupied habitat
Yellow billed Cuckoo	April 15–August 15	Within ½ mile radius

Affected Areas	Restriction	Restricted Area
Bald Eagle Nest	February 1–July 31	Within 1½ mile radius
Bald Eagle Communal Roost	Year round	At least ½ mile of communal roost sites, in coordination with FWS.
Golden Eagle Nest	February 1–July 15	Within 1½ mile radius
Osprey Nest	April 1–July 31	Within 1½ mile radius
Swainson's Hawk Nest	April 1–July 31	Within 1½ mile radius
Ferruginous Hawk Nest	March 1–July 31	Within 1½ mile radius
Goshawk Nest	April 1–August 31	Within 1½ mile radius
Prairie Falcon Nest	April 1–August 31	Within 1½ mile radius
Northern Harrier Nest	April 1–August 31	Within 1½ mile radius
Great Horned Owl Nest	February 1–July 15	Within 1½ mile radius
Red-tailed Hawk Nest	February 1–July 15	Within 1½ mile radius
Burrowing Owl	April 15–September 15	Within 1½ mile radius
Active Raptor Nests	Year round	Within ¼ mile (1, 320 feet)
Other Raptors	February 1–July 15	Within 1½ mile radius
<b>Alternative 4</b>		
Big Game Crucial Winter Ranges	November 15–April 30	Antelope, elk, moose, and mule deer crucial winter ranges
Parturition Areas	May 1–June 30	Identified parturition areas
Greater sage-grouse and Columbian Sharp Tailed grouse Nesting Habitat	(1) March 1–May 20 Prohibit surface disturbance/occupancy Avoid human activity 6:00 p.m.–9:00 a.m.  (2) Within nesting/early brood rearing habitat March 15–July 15	(1) Within ¼ mile of occupied Greater sage-grouse and Columbian sharp tailed grouse nesting habitat  (2) Within 2-mile radius for Greater sage-grouse and within 1-mile radius for Columbian sharp-tailed grouse identified early brood rearing habitat.
Greater sage-grouse leks and Columbian Sharp Tailed grouse	March 1–May 15 Avoid human activity between 8:00 p.m.–8:00 a.m.	Prohibit surface disturbance/occupancy ¼ mile of perimeter of occupied Greater sage-grouse and Columbian sharp tailed-grouse. East of State Highway 789, south of Interstate 80, west of State Highway 71 and Carbon County Road 401, and north of State Highway 70.
Greater sage-grouse and Columbian Sharp Tailed grouse Winter Concentration areas.	November 15–March 14	Within identified winter habitat
Mountain Plover	April 10–July 10	Occupied habitat
Yellow billed Cuckoo	April 15–August 15	Within ½ mile radius
Bald Eagle Nest	February 1–July 31	Within 1 mile radius
Bald Eagle Communal Roost	Year round	At least ½ mile of communal roost sites, in coordination with FWS.
Golden Eagle Nest	February 1–July 31	Within 1 mile radius
Osprey Nest	February 1–July 31	Within ¾ mile radius

Affected Areas	Restriction	Restricted Area
Swainson's Hawk Nest	April 1–July 31	Within $\frac{3}{4}$ mile radius
Ferruginous Hawk Nest	March 1–July 31	Within 1 mile radius
Goshawk Nest	April 1–August 31	Within $\frac{3}{4}$ mile radius
Prairie Falcon Nest	April 1–July 31	Within $\frac{3}{4}$ mile radius
Northern Harrier Nest	April 1–July 31	Within $\frac{3}{4}$ mile radius
Great Horned Owl Nest	February 1–July 15	Within $\frac{3}{4}$ mile radius
Red-tailed Hawk Nest	February 1–July 15	Within $\frac{3}{4}$ mile radius
Burrowing Owl	February 1–July 31	Within $\frac{3}{4}$ mile radius
Active Raptor Nests	Year round	Within 825 feet (ferruginous hawks, 1,200 feet)
Other Raptors	February 1–July 15	Within $\frac{3}{4}$ mile radius